comparative literature

published by the

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation
of the Comparative Literature Section
of the Modern Language
Association of America

T. S. Eliot's *Criterion*: The Editor and his Contributors. By Herbert Howarth. 97

The Distrest Mother, Ambrose Philips' Morality Play. By Paul E. Parnell. 111

Balzac as a Source of George Moore's *Sister Teresa*. By Calvin S. Brown. 124

Lov'd I Not Honour More: The Durability of a Literary Motif. By George Fenwick Jones. 131

The River of Light in the *Anticlaudianus* and the *Divina Commedia*. By Edward Charles Witke. 144

The Drinkers and History: Rabelais, Balzac, and Joyce. By Thomas R. Whitaker. 157

¿Había Leído Darío a Lautréamont Cuando lo Incluyó en *Los Raros?* By Sidonia C. Taupin. 165

Book Reviews. 171

Deutschland-Frankreich (H. H. H. Remak). *George Moore et la France*, by Georges-Paul Collet (Jacqueline E. de La Harpe). *Les "Archives littéraires de l'Europe,"* by Roland Mortier (H. H. H. Remak). *Essais sur Diderot et l'antiquité*, by Jean Seznec (Liselotte Dieckmann). *Morley's Canzonets for Three Voices*, by John Earle Uhler (Nan C. Carpenter). *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre*, ed. by Peter Goolden (A. G. Brodeur). *Keats and the Dramatic Principle*, by Bernice Slote (R. H. Fogle). *Jorge Guillén ou Le Cantique émerveillé*, by Pierre Darmangeat (Bernardo Gicovate). *The Japanese Tradition in British and American Literature*, by Earl Miner (Howard Hibbett). *Trends and Styles in Twentieth Century French Literature*, by Helmut Hatzfeld (A. G. Engstrom).

Books Received. 192

comparative literature

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors—from the earliest times to the present. *Comparative Literature* particularly welcomes longer studies on comprehensive topics and on problems of literary criticism.

Editor
CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor
WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Assistant Editor
PERRY J. POWERS
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Editorial Board
FRANCIS FERGUSSON
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, N. J.

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

VICTOR LANGE
Princeton University
Princeton, N. J.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the post office at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.
The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00.
Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
OCT 31 1959
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

volume xi
spring 1959
number 2

HERBERT HOWARTH

T. S. Eliot's *Criterion*: The Editor and his Contributors

T. S. ELIOT launched *The Criterion* as a quarterly in 1922, almost lost it for want of funds in the fall of 1925, resumed it as a quarterly over the Faber imprint in 1926, made it a monthly in 1927, cut it back to quarterly appearance in June 1928, and then issued it steadily until New Year 1939. In his twenties he had seen the *N.R.F.* assume leadership in French intellectual life, seen Pound energize *The Egoist* and *Poetry,* assisted *The Egoist,* and watched Murry's brief, brilliant, erratic run as editor of *The Athenaeum.* All that he observed, and the tantalizing insufficiency of his participation as subordinate or contributor, had made him eager to direct a periodical himself in his own way. Every young poet is likely to think he would wield the editorial power better than the men he serves, but I doubt whether anyone has been so resolved as Eliot to have his own periodical and control it purposefully. Some flecks of mere ambition may be detected in the resolve. Ambition drove Eliot in successive mutations as it drove his Becket, but not ambition for the mere regalia of editorship—rather the honorable, desperate, and irremediable ambition to pursue and cry a conviction, to be a preacher, a Savonarola (his mother's hero), and to change the world.

He wanted to do what Arnold had credited Newman and the Oxford Movement with doing: "swell the tide of secret dissatisfaction which has mined the ground under the self-confident liberalism of the last thirty years . . . " He hoped to encourage a more ascetic and disciplined orientation, and, as the cultural setting for that severer life, to fortify

and extend through the English-speaking peoples of the world the two-thousand-year-old Attic-Roman-West European tradition.

In this paper I shall speak only incidentally of that besetting temptation of his, that civic and spiritual mission. I shall rather do something which will seem to him, so diffident he is of the value of his creative work, of comparatively narrow importance. I shall treat *The Criterion* as a catalyst in the development of his writing. During his seventeen years as sole editor he was scrupulous beyond the custom of editors. He let nothing go half-considered; and the result was that his contributors' work etched thousands of impressions on his sensibility. To study the files is to feel the play of one mind in every issue, and the continuity of thought from one issue to the next; to see how carefully he read his contributors, how he found in them the provocation for new contributions and sometimes the names of new contributors, whom he then approached with commissions right for their aptitudes and right for his pages, and how the themes or the momentary illumination of his contributors penetrated his mind, lodged in it, and alimented it until over the course of years they emerged in a creative or critical work of his own. I hope to illustrate by three or four examples the dynamic effects which the conscientious editing of *The Criterion* had on Eliot the poet.

I shall begin with the impact of May Sinclair. She had made her reputation early in the first decade of this century, when the young native of St. Louis was taking his first look at the intellectual life of the United States and Britain and condemning it as a desert. During his first years in London he developed a respect for May Sinclair—a qualified respect, I imagine, but a respect. His friend Pound regarded her well, and in 1914 was writing to Harriet Monroe about her courage on the Belgian battlefields with the Red Cross. In 1917, when Eliot's future appeared to lie in philosophy and he was writing notes for the *International Journal of Ethics,* May Sinclair made a foray into that field with her *Defence of Idealism.* It was a work of some interest to him. He had specialized in the idealism of F. H. Bradley, whom he was later to commemorate for sweetness and light, and she had something to say on Bradley. She had even more to say on Indian mysticism, which Eliot had explored a little at Harvard; and the chapter praised by the critics as her best compared the Christian mystics with the Buddhist, to the disadvantage of the Christians but for one exception—Dame Julian of Norwich.

I am sure that Eliot was aware of her book, for it was reviewed by M. W. Robieson next to a short piece by Eliot himself in *IJE* for July 1918. But I believe that he had come across it before that, and read it carefully; for it seems to be the inspiration of his celebrated word "poly-

philoprogenitive" which ushers in his "Sunday Morning Service," printed in September 1918. May Sinclair had written in her nonprofessional and therefore vivid way of the reduction of polytheism to monotheism and of the "philoprogenitive" people of Israel and their passion for the One God. By 1918, then, Eliot had several reasons to be aware of May Sinclair; and in 1922 she joined with Pound and Aldington as signatory of the Bel Esprit manifesto calling for funds to free Eliot for creative work. When he planned the first number of *The Criterion* he requested—and published—a story from her, "The Victim." A year later he published a second story, "Jones's Karma."

"Jones's Karma" had a special appeal for Eliot. It was an Anglo-Indian parable of the relationship between free will and determinism, with a Guru for its expositor. Eliot, like his St. Louis predecessor, Paul Elmer More, and in keeping with a Harvard trend of his time, had believed that there must be a satisfaction in Indian systematics worth the effort of the struggle with Sanskrit. He has told in *After Strange Gods* how he worked for two years at the language under Charles R. Lanman and for a year on Patanjali's metaphysics under James Woods and how this study fascinated him but he abandoned it—because he did not wish to forget "how to think and feel as an American or a European." It was a reluctant abandonment. He did not move to Pound's position (which I recently heard paralleled in a table-talk remark of Robert Frost) that Hindu civilization is soft, formless, passive. All his life he has thrown a lingering look behind; the impulse that drew him to Sanskrit has never been quite extinguished. "Jones's Karma" was perhaps a simplified rendering of the "subtleties" that had perplexed and pleased him when he worked under Woods, but it was put with sufficient fineness to please and perplex him again and justify his printing the story.

Nine years later the story was actively in his mind. He referred to it in *The Criterion* for July 1932 in a context that, at first mention, seems remote—a discussion of Queenie Leavis' *Fiction and the Reading Public*. As Eliot reflected on the rupture between the serious writer and the larger public, his mind moved from the permanence of the need for poetry to the permanence of the need for drama, from there to the potentiality of poetry for revivifying drama, from there (by a notably personal leap which partly depended on his belief that the new drama must be religious, but also implied something further) to the problem of determinism as dramatized in the experience of St. Peter when the cock crew. "This kind of determinism," he remarked, "is essential to Buddhism as well as to Christianity; but whether 'determinism' is the right word for it, I leave unsettled. See *Jones's Karma* by May Sinclair, in *The Criterion* for October, 1923, p. 43." Notice that that formal

reference is given by Eliot himself. He had looked up the files to check his memory of the story, and he judged it so significant that he wanted his readers to go back to it.

Another ten years pass and then, obliquely but unmistakably, the story reappears as an integrated element of *Four Quartets.* In the crucial slow movement of *The Dry Salvages,* when Eliot had interpreted his spiritual illness to himself in terms of his physical and mental migrations, and understood those as simulacra of the permanent human expedition, images from his half-denied Sanskrit shadow-experiences had arisen and deployed in his support. Krishna had spoken to Arjuna in his hearing and for him. Now, designing the equivalent movement for *Little Gidding,* he considered what he had written and what still left unanswered in the third quartet, and the Indian figures in that stimulated the memory of May Sinclair's story. At the end of "Jones's Karma" the Guru had resolved the dilemma of free will and determinism as follows:

> 'When you talk of free-will and bondage you talk of the pairs of opposites. You are free and you are bound also. It is according. But so long as you affirm the reality of the pairs of opposites you are subject to illusions.'
>
> He paused.
>
> 'Notwithstanding, there is a path of perfect freedom. When it is indifferent to a man whether he is himself or not himself, whether he lives or dies, whether he catches the cholera or does not catch the cholera. Thus he escapes from desiring and undesiring, from the pairs of opposites, and from the chain of happenings and the round of births.'

Eliot had long thought of this and agreed with it—or almost agreed with it. There was one word that on reflection he found wrong for a poet with the Western or Christian experience behind him—"indifferent." The connotations of carelessness, tedium, valuelessness needed correction, he thought. And May Sinclair had provided him with a better word in her chapter on mysticism in *The Defence of Idealism*—"detachment."

> There are three conditions which often look alike
> Yet differ completely, flourish in the same hedgerow:
> Attachment to self and to things and to persons, detachment
> From self and from things and from persons; and, growing between
> them, indifference
> Which resembles the others as death resembles life.

He took up the word "detachment," named it as the secret of reconciliation with life, then developed the distinction from "indifference" by making that a word of condemnation, the word for the state which is loss of love instead of ascent to a love beyond the carnal.

Eliot had long hoped to disprove—generously, and as a friend in

communication with a friend, but decisively to disprove—two contentions of the *Defence of Idealism.* May Sinclair had said of mysticism: "So far from there being any way out and forwards in this direction, it would seem that the Mystic Way is the surest way backwards and in." With the help of Heraclitus, Eliot replied that the way backwards is the way forwards and the way forwards the way backwards. She had said of Christian mysticism that it was often "the most horrible tangle of material and carnal imagery." He attempted a poem that offered, and in its music betokened, a love beyond desire. She had said that Christian devotional poetry was unsatisfying because "Most of it is written by people who are not poets. But the worst of it is that it is not supremely devotional." Eliot had been intent for twenty years to prove her wrong by his own practice, and the *Four Quartets* were his deepest endeavor at it, and almost his success, though the eventual glory of the poem is its statement of his life rather than its devotion.

Naturally other writers played a part, as well as May Sinclair, some of them *Criterion* contributors. Mario Praz accelerated Eliot's intent when he reviewed Bremond's *Prayer and Poetry* in July 1929. The young writer T. O. Beachcroft accelerated it when he isolated the paradox of Christian devotional poetry in his study of the metaphysicals some years later. The more these writers showed, like May Sinclair, the necessary discrepancy between mysticism and poetry, the more Eliot was stimulated to that noble contention which he inwardly waged with her for twenty-five years. He wanted, as a Christian poet, to repair the discrepancy.

Throughout the same period he was engaged with another figure in the dialogues of the heart out of which the *Quartets* and the late comedies grew. This was Hugo von Hofmannsthal. During Eliot's first visit to Europe the *Rosenkavalier* had elated the opera public. It reached England two years later; typical reactions among the writers were Ricketts' "a quite new attempt to rediscover the old lost comedy of character and intrigue" and Arnold Bennett's "beauty and symmetry." London and Oxford were still talking about it when Eliot slipped out of Germany and found a haven at Merton in late 1914. And they were talking even more avidly of another, though, as it proved, less durable, Strauss-Hofmannsthal collaboration, *The Legend of Joseph,* which Karsavina and the Russian Ballet had danced at the Drury Lane Theater in June 1914. The intelligence of London had crowded to the rehearsal—and the beauty of London, too, for it was here that Lady Diana Manners made her celebrated climb from one box to another above the admiring auditorium. I am not sure whether Eliot was already acquainted with Hofmannsthal's work—it would be of immense interest

to know more than we do at present about his reading, his theater-going, his contacts in Germany during 1911 and 1914—but in Oxford, at the latest, his attention must have been called to it; ballet, and especially the Russian Ballet, was his passion, and his ear must have been alert to the talk.

With the first issue of *The Criterion* Eliot showed that he desired to restore the intellectual communications between England and Germany that had been severed by the war. He invited Hermann Hesse to describe recent German poetry. The article was brief and too general to make interesting reading today, but we see the editor's point in commissioning it. Possibly a little disappointed, both by its quality and the news it reported, he waited a year before he printed another German work. This time he offered Hofmannsthal's *Greece,* a vivid intuition of the Attic light and its "transparent haziness." After that there was frequent and excellent German work in *The Criterion,* especially from Ernst Robert Curtius. A. W. G. Randall surveyed German periodicals in almost every number, picking out from time to time statements by Hofmannsthal and particularly reporting on Hofmannsthal's own *Neue deutsche Beiträge.* The poet died on July 15, 1929. In October 1929 Eliot printed in his regular personal Commentary these words: "OF YOUR CHARITY Pray for the soul of Hugo von Hofmannsthal." There were no additional remarks, none of that obituary reflection which has sometimes been an evasive mode for Eliot (consider, for example, with what skill he contrived to say almost nothing in his *Horizon* obituary for Virginia Woolf). I seem to read in that bare sentence, which is careless of the charge of rhetoric, Eliot's surrender of the simulation of detachment for the confession of involvement and of a community with Hofmannsthal. It is the prose equivalent of the spare burial habit which Hofmannsthal had requested—did Eliot know of it?—the robe of a Franciscan friar.

In August 1929 Curtius in an article in the *Neue Schweizer Rundschau* bracketed Hofmannsthal with Maurras and Eliot as a "representative of the restoration, the 'conservative revolution' "; and Eliot was indeed drawn to the Viennese because he shared the sense of classic form which "is the reflection of eternal strength." By that identity of object he was first drawn to Hofmannsthal; then out of it developed a deeper affinity.

While he was brooding on Hofmannsthal's death, or rather on the significance of his personality and work thrown into relief by his death, he received an article from one of his European correspondents, Max Rychner, a most attractive writer. Printed in *The Criterion* for July 1930, it centers on the discussion of the *Letter of Lord Chandos,* in

which Hofmannsthal tells how creative genius reaches a phase when it can no longer revel in the sensual world, breaks down, freezes spiritually, cannot use an abstract word, beset by formidable doubt of its meaning, can only revive if it can find a new language, "a tongue of which not a single word is known to me, a language in which dumb things have spoken to me." Rychner applies the sense of the *Letter* to the heroes of the works Hofsmannsthal had written before it:

> So rich is their inner life that they feel themselves estranged in the outer world of sense, and almost come to doubt its reality. They dimly guess that the language they have heard and learned from others can only supply an approximation to what they feel to be the most living thing within them, and it is as the logical outcome of such a state of mind that Lord Chandos condemns himself to silence.

Rychner then adds:

> The poet Hofmannsthal overcame this tragic stage, he passed through this dark borderland of mystical world negation and emerged as victor.

This article came to Eliot when he was entering his own borderland, the period of barren silence when he questioned whether he would write again. He could not know whether he would transcend the crisis as Rychner showed that Hofmannsthal had transcended it, but the success of Hofmannsthal encouraged him to accept his malady and to persevere. When he had crossed to the other side of his problem four years later, the memory of the *Letter* and Rychner's article made him, by nature a scrutinizer of himself, doubly conscious of the experience he had undergone. If Beethoven's lack of language sensibility and Mallarmé's love of the word beyond the word's meaning are involved in the fifth movement of the *Quartets* where the poet's articulation is considered, so also is Hofmannsthal's loss and recovery of the validity of words (and so are those passages from Praz and Beachcroft which I have already mentioned, and especially a quotation from Wackenroder which Praz gave in a footnote: "Die irdischen Dinge haben wir in unserer Hand wenn wir ihren Namen aussprechen").

At the outset of the *Letter of Lord Chandos* Eliot had noticed a phrase which challenged him to conceive of comedy as the mode of his late work, if he could ever win through to the stage of late work. Only the great men, "die von der Gefährlichkeit des Lebens durchdrungen und dennoch nicht entmutigt sind," have the power of lightness and jest, "der Leichtigkeit und des Scherzes," said Chandos. To this power Eliot did win through. He had always longed to create a theater; he had always had, half-expressed in his poetry, the twist of comedy. In the 1930s his first full-length plays depended on gravity; at last in the late

1940s and 1950s he spun, slight and simple but effective, a theater of comic poetry.

There is an illuminating relationship between *The Criterion* and the plays. Throughout the periodical's life, and especially in the first dozen numbers, appear striking statements on the problem of the rehabilitation of the theater. Essentially Eliot has never thought of the poet as writing for himself, but for the whole social organism, and therefore has seen an urgent need to renew the poetic drama as a living experience of the general theater audience. The famous memorial tribute to Marie Lloyd in his second issue depends on that conviction:

> The working man who went to the music-hall and saw Marie Lloyd and joined in the chorus was himself performing part of the act; he was engaged in that collaboration of the audience with the artist which is necessary in all art and most obviously in dramatic art.

Like George Moore and Arthur Symons, who hung about the music halls, savoring their vitality, and made a cult of them a quarter of a century earlier, Eliot blamed the middle class for the dearth of theater; Marie Lloyd was an idol of the lower classes, "the expression and dignity of their own lives"; but the middle class, too weak to have tastes of its own, had no such expressive figure.

Eliot considered what features of the serious stage could be strengthened to compel the imaginative participation of the middle-class audience. The ballet provided a clue. It is clear that his nerves were quickened by ballet to a passionate response which, in accordance with his nature, he converted into theorizing and didactics, tinged, however, with the exaltation of the actual theater. (Later, after protean shifts, he was also to transpose it into poetry.) He reflected on the character of ballet from the standpoint of anthropology and comparative religion, to which the example of the versatile James Woods had led him, and from which he has consistently worked. His thinking is displayed in *The Criterion* for April 1925, in a review of two books, Cecil Sharpe's *The Dance* and A. P. Oppe's *Mudras: The Ritual Hand Poses of the Buddha Priests and Shiva Priests.* He suggests that there is a correspondence to be traced by neurology between the rhythms and patterns of the dance and the complex patterns of the nerves. He points out that the evolution of Christian and other religious ritual is a part of the evolution of the dance: "For is not the High Mass—as performed, for instance, at the Madeleine in Paris—one of the highest developments of dancing?" Writing in April 1923 on Massine and his symbolic gestures, he had urged the dramatist to adopt a "ritual": "The failure of the contemporary stage to satisfy the craving for ritual is one of the reasons why it is not a living art." If these two quotations are taken together,

the structure and tone of the climaxes of Eliot's plays are explained. Eliot's aim in drama is the participation of the whole audience in a religious ritual.

It is clear how he has accomplished that effect in his Canterbury play. We are Canterbury. We are the congregation hearing the Christmas morning sermon, and are the people crying after the death. It is clear in *The Cocktail Party* how he seeks the effect, but not equally clear whether he has accomplished it. When the ritual at the end of Act II is performed and the Vedaic prayers are spoken for the building of the marriage hearth and for the protection of Celia on her journey, we are present—and we should be collaborating. But I do not know whether in the result we feel free to enter a circle so oligarchical and esoteric as that constituted by the three ministers.

The consecration ritual of *The Cocktail Party* resorts to language austere and taut, which Eliot had first met in Lanman's Sanskrit reader at Harvard. But the staple of *The Cocktail Party* is very different—it is cocktail-party language, or rather the mimicry of that language and the selection and arrangement of its phrases so that a strange bloom distils from them.

I suspect that part of the spell Hofmannsthal cast on Eliot lay in the fact that—allowing for the dissimilar demands of his language and time and place—Hofmannsthal had done something of the same kind. Walter Brecht has defined Hofmannsthal's distinction as the simultaneous possession of a civilized, even sophisticated, quasi-French exterior and a mystic interior. Eliot, listening to the talk of civilized Bloomsbury and sophisticated Mayfair, hoped to master that double effect. In 1924, 1925, and 1926 *The Criterion* contains contributions that seem editorial ineptitudes until we realize that they are shots—bosh shots but the first range-finding shots—at this technique. The queerest of them is by Eliot himself, a story, "On the Eve," published in the January 1925 issue. It arises from an idea he had disclosed to Arnold Bennett in September 1924 for (Bennett told his diary) "a drama of modern life (furnished flat sort of people) in a rhythmic prose." Its purpose is clear in the perspective of thirty-three years. It demonstrates its author's ear for people speaking, his gift for reproducing drawing-room gabble. But the story form does not suit him; it must have been a puzzle in 1925, and a disappointment to the poet, who dropped the form, not realizing how close he had veered toward his ultimate comic method. But that he was feeling for a method is shown by his publication of comparable pieces—for example, two stories by Ferion Morris, "Thé Dansant" in October 1924 and "Night Club" in April 1925, and a cocktail-party story by Aldous Huxley, "The Monocle," in January 1926. In the Huxley story there

is a gambit about a lion huntress, which Eliot imitated and improved in the story of the tigers—or was it no tigers?—anyway, left half-told, alas!—at the curtain-up of *The Cocktail Party.*

These experiments, though discontinued after 1926 as far as *The Criterion's* prose is concerned, had a consequence—the *Sweeney Agonistes* fragments. Here Eliot moves towards that lower-class stratum he discussed in the Marie Lloyd article; perhaps he only reaches the lower middle class; but he goes deliberately towards the seedy, in the direction indicated by the Impressionists, Moore, Symons, and the Ash-Can School at the turn of the century. Some of his early poems had caught the secret colors of depression. So do the Sweeney fragments. But they remained fragments. He could not complete a whole work in the style. He did not know the milieu, for all his sharp intuition of it, quite enough. Nor would the violent dance beat of the verse have been tolerable to the ear through a full-length drama. He had to pass through the silence and the solemn rebeginnings of the 1930s and early 1940s before he could do what he had imagined in 1924 and do it for the middle class—which he had said had no taste or hero, but which he frequented and loved and disdained and pitied, and to which he gave a hero, Becket—and do it with an infinitely subtle dance beat, which was not only tolerable but captivatingly and flexibly expressive through a full-length drama.

The spiritual crisis which led Eliot to write his grave disquisitions of the 1930s before he could attempt poetic comedy lies outside the scope of this paper. But some of the external stimuli which brought him to the subject, setting, and treatment of his first complete play can be traced in *The Criterion* and should be mentioned. In June 1928 he devoted a paragraph of his Commentary to John Masefield's *The Coming of Christ,* a miracle play performed at Canterbury. He found its poetry and its doctrine equally feeble: "We venture to counsel our spiritual pastors, that they should see to it either that they employ artists who are definite in their theology, or else who are really good artists." The artist who criticizes another's work is always likely to be bidden to do it better and, if he is as sincere as Eliot, he is almost bound to challenge himself to do it better. Masefield's inadequate Canterbury play confirmed a trend which Eliot's dramatic ambition had already taken. He had been casting for a theme appropriate to a drama at once popular and sacred. He had been reading mediaeval history extensively; and as an Anglican and, from 1927, a British subject, Canterbury had special associations for him, and he was ready to celebrate the metropolis of his Church.

Other stimuli leading to the Canterbury play may be found in minor reviews in *The Criterion* from 1927. Eliot regarded the review pages, to which he allocated extensive space, as the most important in the peri-

odical. He handled new books himself and very carefully assessed their interest before he chose the reviewers; and when the reviews came in he took pains to place them in order of their social significance. The seminal effect of the reviews on their editor were at least as great as that of the principal articles, perhaps greater. In October 1927 he printed an anonymous review of Sidney Dark's biography of Becket. In November 1927 he printed an anonymous review of Herbert Read's *English Stained Glass*; while this short review does not touch on Canterbury, the book does. It naturally includes illustrations from Canterbury, and there are three pages quoting the passage in the *Golden Legend* on the courtship of Becket's parents. Until *The Family Reunion* and the lively *Confidential Clerk,* Eliot shirked the issue of parental relations, and *Murder in the Cathedral* is in any case notable for its concentration on the central action; but there is one remote echo of the courtship story. Becket's father, when prisoner in the East, had fallen in love with a Turkish princess, who had wandered across Europe to find him again and be his wife. Read praised the story for quaintness and pathos. Eliot inverts his judgment, and lists such a love among the illusions in which the four slaughterers will waste their days:

> Go seek alliance with the heathen Saracen,
> To share his filthy rites, and try to snatch
> Forgetfulness in his libidinous courts...

This is a marginal, though perhaps not a negligible, point. Much more constructively suggestive to Eliot was *Thomas à Becket in Art* by Tancred Borenius, which F. Wormald reviewed for him in October 1932. The first paragraph of the review seized Eliot's attention. There are three feasts of St. Thomas, Wormald pointed out: that of December 29 commemorates his martyrdom; that of July 7, the translation, fifty years later, of his bones to a magnificent shrine; and that of December 2, more rarely celebrated, the Regressio S. Thomae, "commemorating the return of the exile to Canterbury in 1170." Eliot had, of course, known from the start that he must tell the story of the martyrdom, as the climax of his play. From the Feast of the Translation, which reminded him of his own ambition for glory (and this he deplored), he averted his eyes, except to include it briefly among the offers of the most dangerous tempter. But the Feast of the Regressio gave light and order to Eliot's thoughts of Becket, bringing Becket's career into relation with his own, since he was on the verge of his own Regressio, his return to America; and when he wrote the play he raised the curtain at that crucial moment of December 2. Eliot took other suggestions from Borenius—he noticed the reference to Becket's "vividness of speech,"

and was struck by the sentence, "There arose . . . quickly a tendency to establish a parallel between the last days of St. Thomas and the Passion of Christ." But the Regressio was the real discovery; it may be that Wormald's paragraph and Borenius' book turned the Canterbury play from a speculative possibility to a psychological necessity.

Eliot made a lucky choice of subject which brought him at once within the periphery of popular drama. Both the theme and the tone of *Murder in the Cathedral* were right for the British amateur-drama public—a widespread nexus of half-informed but eager men and women in every town and village, who regularly give plays for their friends and relatives, follow new productions with a provincial hunger, and are the potential mediators in Britain between the artist and the general audience. *Murder in the Cathedral* employed and delighted the choral speakers who are trained by elocutionists in every British borough; it engaged the vague but powerful religious sentiment of British folk; it presented a living legend, for the story of this St. Thomas is told in every English elementary school. The play became "the expression and dignity" of the middle class; and that is the root of its substantial popularity.

But the autobiographical implications must not be forgotten—the parallel between the Archbishop's long absence and Eliot's own absence from America; and the fact that his protagonist had his name, so that the tempter voices resonate as if they were his own introspection: "Old Tom, gay Tom, Becket of London . . . " This poet, a self-styled classicist, is an autobiographical poet, just as he is elsewhere, more obviously, an autobiographical critic. Even his book of practical cats is mainly about Old Toms.

The Becket suggestions in *The Criterion* were absorbed, meditated, and made into the play by Eliot over seven years—a relatively short time, certainly shorter than the twenty-years evolution of the May Sinclair material with which this paper opened. There is also a case where a *Criterion* hint was quiescent for twenty-five years and then emerged in a play. After the early performances of *The Cocktail Party* had puzzled some journalists—who were too ready to be puzzled; of the criticisms that may be leveled at the play, obscurity is not one—Eliot pointed out that it follows the pattern of the *Alcestis*. In the fourth number of *The Criterion*, July 1923, he had published an article by Stanley Rice, "Alcestis and Savitri: A Suggestion." Rice had summarized—in order to answer through a comparison with the Mahabhárata—the usual objection to the dithyrambic Herakles:

> . . . how, it is said, can we recognize in this drunken reveller the semi-divine hero of Greek legend? He comes into the house with importunate demands for service, calls for wine, and drinks himself into a semi-maudlin state, 'crowning his head

with myrtle sprigs' and 'howling discordance,' and later giving the servant a sermon of drunken solemnity on the vanity of human life.

That is the prescription for the Unidentified Guest of the first act of the *Cocktail Party*. Eliot had obviously been attracted by an article which united his warring interests, the Attic and the Sanskrit; he was sensitive to its suggestions; and this account of Herakles was curiously vivid to him as a specter of the paradox of his own mind, discordantly solemn and comic, discordantly mundane and divine, discordantly Western and Eastern.

It would be possible to find more of Harcourt-Reilly in *The Criterion* —above all, to plot how Eliot grew from a frowning doubt of psychoanalysis, and a fear that it was too rash an intruder on religion, to this identification of Herakles, that strong recoverer of the dead, with the modern clinician-priest who raises the living dead. It would be possible to trace the growth of other late work: the change from antipathy for Kipling to sympathy for him; the several accounts, in issues of the 1930s, of Nicholas Ferrar and Little Gidding. Eliot was constantly learning from his contributors, not borrowing from them but receptively absorbing and reconstituting what they suggested to him. He gave as much to them; he commissioned and inspired work connected with the subjects towards which his creative imagination was flowing, and much that came to his pages already reflected his mind and the force of his personality. But, conversely, he had an extraordinary capacity for perceiving the power in another man's experience and extending himself to absorb it. He was helped, too, by a certain contentiousness that made him work mentally on challenging dicta until he had discriminated in them what he must rebut and what he must use—and sometimes he used them by rebutting. But the creative interaction with his contributors was, supremely, a function of his scruples. Because he was so utterly serious as an editor he pondered every word with care, and every word left its exact impression.

The final affirmation of his seriousness was the closure of *The Criterion* in January 1939. It was not finance that subdued Eliot. The monetary losses, attendant on every cultural paper in England, his publishers had borne and would have continued to bear. But the impending war in western Europe destroyed the premise on which he had conducted *The Criterion*—the supposition of a comity of nations sharing a tradition and communicating with each other for its world-wide development. He wrote in the last number that he had seen the breakdown of the thesis several years earlier and had then changed from the Europeanizing policy to an insular policy of encouraging new British writers. But the change of policy had not been so decisive as it seemed in retro-

spect. It had been at most half a change, conducted half-consciously; and most of the new writers he had, with remarkable judgment, encouraged had looked beyond the island-margins for their interests. He still held some hope for Europe until the Czech crisis in the late summer of 1938. Then he could not hope; he could only prove the sincerity of the position he had held by shutting down the periodical with which he had defended it. And that now gave him the time, the freedom, for the fuller creative consideration of the suggestions that his contributors had intimated to him.

University of Pittsburgh

PAUL E. PARNELL

The Distrest Mother, Ambrose Philips' Morality Play

THE PURPOSES of the English dramatists in early adaptations from Racine have never been satisfactorily explained. Katherine Wheatley has shown in *Racine and English Classicism*[1] how thoroughly the psychology and passion of the original was usually modified toward melodrama, heroicizing, and sentimentality, traditions which today seem absurdly inferior. When Professor Wheatley sees Ambrose Philips in *The Distrest Mother* replace the ruthless speech of Oreste, "C'est trop gémir tout seul," with a conventional piece of rant, she throws up her hands in dismay: "It is impossible to guess what impelled Philips to make such a change."[2]

A satisfactory answer must take into consideration the purposes of the translator or adaptor. And the purposes of Philips, a member of the Addison clique, were those of the group: a desire to improve morals, a belief in middle-class virtue, and an opposition to pure formalism. The significance of Philips' play lies in its attempt, by a member of an important literary group, to introduce the English to a great French masterpiece. If it now seems that the adaptor did not grasp the peculiar qualities of the original, it must be understood that he succeeded in his aims: a simplified characterization, an increase in emotionalism, and a sharpened didactic emphasis. The result was to change the *Andromaque* of Racine into something like a morality play. The popularity of the adaptation throughout the eighteenth century shows how much these changes accorded with English taste. Since the changes in plot have

[1] Katherine E. Wheatley, *Racine and English Classicism* (Austin, Tex., 1956).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

already been thoroughly observed, the present study will center on three main lines of inquiry: first, what Philips and his friends thought of Racine; second, the changes in characterization; finally, Philips' development of a standardized "moral nomenclature" to drive home the lesson of the play.

Philips accepted the improvement of manners and morals as the first obligation of the artist; and, like his mentors Addison and Steele, he believed that standards of taste and decorum should owe less to class than to self-restraint and self-improvement. What the theater needed, he felt, was not the superficial grandeur of costume and ceremony but a *moral* grandeur. "Real Greatness in Writing," explained Philips in his preface to *The Distrest Mother* (London, 1712), "consists in an unaffected Simplicity," rising out of "noble Sentiments and strong images of Nature." All these qualities were looked for and found in Racine. Andromache was discovered to be "a tender Mother, an affectionate Wife, and a Widow full of Veneration for . . . her deceased Husband," an array of virtues not surpassed in any sentimental comedy. Steele's prologue pointed out that "Pyrrhus *provok'd*" would be "*to no wild Rants betray'd,*" even though he might resent "*his generous Love so ill repay'd.*" Steele ignored the fact that Pyrrhus' generous love for Andromache is an infidelity to his fiancée; noble qualities have to be admired even if questionable implications go unregarded. Jilted Hermione, although "injur'd," nobly shows her pride "in conscious Majesty"; and any tendency to hysteria is overlooked by the same tact. These opening remarks see the purpose of the play not as a delineation of truth by detached character analysis, but as a representation of illustrious moral examples for the improvement of the audience. Faults and weaknesses, where they become manifest, will be forgiven so long as they are not malicious. Passion is only an excess of love. One feels the implacable scrutiny of Racine already dissolving in a wave of good feeling.

If the real purpose of Racine's play is to present several extremely noble souls in a painfully competitive situation, then the action and dialogue must make the audience continuously aware of all this moral grandeur. Therefore all the principal personages must be considerably elevated in character. Orestes and Pylades are improved from the very first line:

> Oreste: Oui, puisque je retrouve un ami si fidèle[3]
>
> Orestes: O *Pylades*! What's Life without a Friend![4]

[3] Paul Mesnard, ed., *Œuvres de Racine* (Paris, 1865-86), II, *Andromaque*, I, i, 1. All quotations from *Andromaque* are from this edition.

[4] Ambrose Philips, *The Distrest Mother* (London, 1712), p. 1. All quotations are from this edition.

In the French, Orestes is rather coldly pleased that he has recovered a friend who is so abject; in the adaptation he is in transports of joy and devotion. As for Pylades, his emotion overflows the bounds of language, and only a heartfelt embrace can speak for him. Orestes still has, in English, his spells of frenzy, but he is pathetically anxious to control them: "May no . . . Stroke of Fate / . . . tear me from my self" (p. 1). The morbid self-pity decaying into violence of Racine's Oreste is naturally avoided; Philips' Orestes is a decent but lovesick boy, lacking in self-control but not in fidelity to the beautiful Hermione.

One notices that Pylades encourages his friend by such praise as "The Thought was worthy Agamemnon's Son" (p. 3). In Philips, the function of retainers and confidants is to keep the great personages they accompany up to the mark. Orestes, Pyrrhus, and the rest have noble qualities but, being human, they do not always live up to them; and, if they backslide, someone must tell them so. The audience must understand that error is error. Hence Phoenix becomes a vigorous individual who gives his master Pyrrhus the severest reprimands.

> My Royal Master, talk of her no more:
> I do not like this Anger. Your *Hermione*
> Should now engross your thoughts.
> (Page 22)

Hermione, according to the prologue, was to be shown as a high-spirited princess who sought a just revenge without self-pity or loss of dignity. Unfortunately Philips was not capable of imagining a young girl acting like a princess, and she emerges as a headstrong hoyden, abused by the man she loves and helpless to do anything about it. She becomes, for greater pathos, a more passive figure; and, to a greater extent than Racine might have believed possible, she is fitted into the English ruined-girl tradition. Orestes speaks of the "divine *Hermione*" who "Gave up her self, in all her Charms, to Pyrrhus" (p. 3). The French gives her a more active role: "Hermione à Pyrrhus prodiguait tous ses charmes" (I, i, 50). In the adaptation, Cleone's statement of the case emphasizes exactly those aspects that would obtain if she had been betrayed by a young fox-hunting nobleman:

> To draw you from your Father! Then to leave you!
> In his own Court to leave you—for a Captive!
> (Page 15)

It adds further to the pathos of the situation that in her innocence (intact, in spite of the innuendo) she is still blind to his duplicity. She "takes his Indignation all for Love" (p. 5). The poor girl is, however, decent enough to remember how she neglected her old flame, Orestes:

"I blush to think, / How I have us'd him" (p. 14). Racine's young fury is concerned only with the welfare of her amour-propre:

> Quelle honte pour moi, quel triomphe pour lui,
> De voir mon infortune égaler son ennui!
> (II, i, 395-396)

The reassurances of Cleone must be transferred from a confidence in Hermione's beauty to a belief in her moral integrity. "Le pouvoir de vos charmes" becomes "Your Beauty and your Worth." In case anyone suspects that her moral distinction is compromised, Cleone answers the objection before it is spoken: "*Orestes* comes in time / To save your Honour" (p. 15). (Racine: "écoutez donc Oreste.")

There is a reason for the difference in emphasis. The French see love as a real battle of the sexes, in which the weapons of each side are roughly equal, since they are mainly psychological. The English view is much simpler—the main male asset is physical force, and the woman's only hope is the pathos of virtuous weakness. If a woman loses her virtue, she has no claim on anyone's sympathy; but she might as well lose her virtue as engage in psychological maneuvering. Weeping and righteous indignation are the only procedures countenanced.

It is therefore necessary to expunge the ruthless and vicious elements from Hermione's character also, and to give her crimes a different motivation. In Racine, Hermione is suffering from a fatal blow to her amour-propre. She wants Pyrrhus but distrusts and hates him; she despises Oreste and feels the humiliation of having to rely on him; at last by her increasing irresponsibility of action she destroys herself and them. Philips, on the other hand, sees Hermione as a wronged woman with strong passions, and he views passions not merely as a reprehensible lack of self-control but as the positive spiritual force of an individual. A person utterly without passions would be spiritually impotent. An excess of passion, ill controlled, means that the person has good stuff in him but lacks discipline. Hermione, with no father to guide her, and rejected by the man she loves, must be excused if her passions often get the better of her. But there can be no festering of her emotions until they become morbid. In English drama, they must become more and more external until they break out, a little before the final violence, in rant. But rant which avoids any malice or vice, and even any impressive (and hence too sympathetic) rhetorical displays, can only be a series of hysterical ejaculations, devoid of insights and almost of sense. Hermione in her "tantrums" strongly resembles Orestes in his "madness."

The development of Pyrrhus in Philips' play is in line with what we have already seen. The polite callousness has disappeared, and the ap-

palling truculence. The adaptor has not deprived him of his vigor, but has given it a bluff, hearty, direct tone, full of determination. As Pylades says in the first scene:

> *Pyrrhus* is proud, impetuous, headstrong, fierce;
> Made up of Passions:
> (Page 4)

These are the ingredients of a royal will. But he can never be courtly or suave, since those qualities have a suspicious unctuousness about them suggestive of foreigners and vice. When the English Pyrrhus has to tell Andromache that her fears are groundless, he is incapable of a gallantry like "Madame, mes refus ont prévenu vos larmes" (I, iv, 281). Instead, he blurts out:

> Dry up those Tears: I must not see you weep:
> And know, I have rejected their Demands.
> (Page 10)

And the possible *légèreté* of the French, "Je ne balance point, je vole à son secours" (I, iv, 287), is replaced by a sturdy English resolve: "I am determin'd to defend your Son" (p. 10). Such a king is clearly as preoccupied with moral questions as the others in the play. He also has to think about maintaining his royal dignity:

> I may in time give Proofs, that I am a Lover:
> But never must forget, that I am a King.
> (Pages 8-9)

Of course he has to be divested of the discreditable overtones attaching to Racine's king. When the English Pyrrhus speaks of Troy, he can only refer to the "heat of Conquest" that "rouz'd all our Rage, / And blindly hurry'd us through Scenes of Death" (p. 8). He may not refer complacently, like Racine's monarch, to "meurtre." Even the love that leads Philips' king to abjure his obligations arises from a creditable impulse—pity for a woman in difficulties, along with admiration for her beauty. Such an impulse must have more warmth than can be found in the standardized French language, even at the risk of sounding adolescent: "You know my Heart is yours: my Soul hangs on you" (p. 12). And, when his devotion is rebuffed, he cannot turn on her as fiercely as he does in French; he has to warn her of his dangerous passions, which are now aroused by her refusal, and are therefore her responsibility, not his: "For know, inhuman Beauty, / . . . My disorder'd Soul / Wavers between th'Extremes of Love and Rage" (p. 12). Fortunately, his bluster is limited by his gentler emotions. The threats are noticeably softer in adaptation. In the French, Pyrrhus snarls as Andromache leaves to see her son:

> ... en le voyant, votre amour plus timide
> Ne prendra pas toujours sa colère pour guide.
> (I, iv, 380-382)

Her love will be "timid" for her own sake, as well as her son's. In the adaptation, this sarcasm is replaced by an emotional appeal.

> ... visit this unhappy Son.
> The Sight of him may bend your stubborn Heart,
> And turn to Softness your unjust Disdain.
> (Page 13)

The character of Andromache, as the title indicates, was to the adaptor the most enticing challenge in the French play. She was equally admirable as mother, wife, and widow, she was beautiful, and she was a captive. Her captivity is a detail much insisted on in the adaptation, possibly because loss of liberty seems a greater calamity in libertarian England; also her helplessness is appealing to the lachrymose emotions. But, given Philips' preoccupations, Andromache would seem destined to become too passive a character. The subtleties of "la coquetterie vertueuse" are likely to confuse and even compromise the moral emphasis; and, without her delicate display of tactics, she has little to do except weep and wring her hands.

The answer is that Andromache is not conceived primarily as a consistent characterization, but as a means of appealing to an audience's admiration. Philips realized that an English audience would never view Andromache objectively; she was "virtuous," in distress, and therefore sympathetic. Furthermore, virtue for an uncorrupted Englishwoman is more than a gentle, purified equivalent of masculine "honor"; it is a stock in trade, and something to be regarded with complacency and mentioned without false modesty. Tears are an accepted means of emphasizing this moral distinction; and, if this appeal to the better instincts of another is disregarded, more direct and less tender procedures are justified. So it is that an English heroine may, after sighing ineffectually for several acts, suddenly become as vigorous as an Old Testament prophetess.

First, the heartbreaking status quo. In I, iv of the Racine play Andromaque meets Pyrrhus as she goes to visit her son, and explains:

> J'allois, Seigneur, pleurer un moment avec lui: [Astyanax]
> Je ne l'ai point encore embrassé d'aujourd'hui.
> (I, iv, 263-264)

This is a pathetic appeal, but to Pyrrhus more than to us. Philips aims his pathos straight at his audience.

> I go to weep a few sad Moments with him!
> I have not yet, to Day, embraced my Child;
> I have not held him in my widow'd Arms.
> (Page 9)

The mention of her own widowhood, like the triple use of the pronoun "I," removes the emphasis from her son to herself. She is less a self-effacing mother than a beautiful example of maternal affection, which in Anglo-Saxon countries is permitted to exist apart from an object. She thus has the right to be more self-righteous than her French counterpart, and she scorns Andromaque's skillful fencing with words. When in Racine Pyrrhus offers to rebuild Troy for Astyanax, Andromaque is humbly evasive: "Seigneur, tant de grandeurs ne nous touchent plus guère" (I, iv, 333). Perhaps "nous," referring ostensibly to mother and child, need not completely exclude Pyrrhus; but no such ambiguities are to be found in the adaptation: "Such Dreams of Greatness suit not *my* Condition" (p. 12). A similarly ambiguous use of "nous" may be found in "Votre amour contre *nous* allume trop de haine" (I, iv, 341), similarly made self-assertive in the English, "Your Love creates *me* Envy" (p. 12). Andromache is close to being another Pamela.

The sympathy of the audience is solicited with double force in these scenes because Philips has carefully edited the speeches of Pyrrhus so as to underline the pathos and suppress the cruelty. In Pyrrhus' description of the scene between mother and son, the bitterness of "Sa misère l'aigrit; et toujours plus farouche" becomes merely "Wild with Distress." The impatience of "en l'embrassant toujours" becomes poignancy: "Then strain'd him in her Arms" (II, v, 649, 652; p. 21). Because of this editing, we feel (in the English) the king's fundamentally good instincts that may yet bring him around.

Naturally Andromache cannot be an ingénue luring the monarch away from his lawful intended. She has, on the contrary, to remind him of his obligations: "Return to your betroth'd *Hermione*" (p. 12). (Racine: "retournez à la fille d'Hélène.") If, after being reminded so specifically of his duties, he insists on staying, what is a poor distressed woman to do? And, when she begs for assistance from Hermione, Andromache may not employ the shrewdness of Racine's Andromaque, who mentioned the aid Hector once gave Hermione's mother Helen:

> J'ai su de mon Hector lui procurer l'appui.
> Vous pouvez sur Pyrrhus ce que j'ai pu sur lui.
> (III, iv, 875-876)

Andromache's whole appeal must be to the sentiments:

> But, Oh, I have a Son!—And you, one Day,
> Will be no Stranger to a Mother's Fondness:
> (Page 28)

And so on. But the same rectitude may also condemn Hermione as soon as she refuses (no French equivalent):

> Youth and Prosperity have made her vain:
> She has not seen the fickle Turns of Life.
> (Page 29)

This is, in fact, the author's judgment on Hermione. She has not suffered, and she lacks pity; henceforth she can no longer claim our sympathy.

So far, Philips' revisions are seen to be in the direction of moral persuasion; the characters are basically admirable, with a few clearly labeled flaws, all for the improvement of the audience. There is an increased need for generalization, so that the audience will know exactly what to think about every action, and a corresponding loss of interest in particular psychological states, which might teach nothing of value. The unpleasant is softened, and the morbid or malicious is expunged. It must be admitted that, given Philips' goals, this simplification and standardization of ideas and characters follows logically. The variety of characterization in Racine is, didactically considered, only a confusion. It is only when all the characters become similar and struggle with similar problems that the conclusion, with its distribution of failures and triumphs, can be really illuminating. The old morality plays standardized by personifying traits and emotions under tag names such as "Faith," "Fellowship," and so on; none of the characters could act in contradiction to their names. Philips must at least maintain the appearance of unique individuality in his characters. But he can use a standardized moral nomenclature to describe the emotions and traits that every really heroic character must control or utilize. Philips' use of this nomenclature is so consistent and precise that the emotions suggested are almost personified, and seem to act as powerfully as the main personages of the play in determining the final outcome.

First of the key terms is Love, a warm and tender altruism like Andromache's. This emotion can hardly exist to excess, for it benefits others and one's own character. It might be described as "enlightened unselfishness." Passion is, however, a more violent inclination, a stronger, more sensual, less disciplined sort of love. If controlled, it can lead to great accomplishment; if not, it can lead to catastrophe. Those characters who have strong Passions, and are denied Love, may give way to Rage, which is more than mere anger and approaches the infatuation of Greek tragedy. Generally, Rage is a burning, aggressive emotion that leads to irreparable crimes. The Greek soldiers, aroused by the calculated insult of Pyrrhus' marriage to Andromache, give way to Rage and kill the king. Hermione's heart in III, i, divided "betwixt Rage and

Love," is a true battleground between the good emotion and the bad, and consequently a psychological struggle has become an allegory. The extreme neurosis of Racine's Oreste, who hesitates between masochism and rape, is also changed by Philips into Rage, partly to soften the offense, partly because Orestes' fault is also a passionate loss of self-control. Rage never brooks delay. Hermione insists on the immediate murder of Pyrrhus because "my wrath's impatient." When Orestes asks her to reconsider, she exclaims, "You but mock my Rage." The extreme degree of Rage is Distraction, a complete loss of self-control such as is demonstrated by Hermione's behavior in V, ii.

> I'll over-turn the Altar; stab the Priest!
> I'll hurl Destruction like a Whirlwind round me!
> ... with-hold me not! I am all Distraction!
> (Page 50)

Often this abandonment of self-discipline is accompanied by a complete ignorance of one's own actions. Orestes explains his project for abduction, "I knew not what I did! / My Purposes were wild" (p. 24).

But even if Rage is controlled, an indulgence of one's Passions can lead to Ruin, a vague all-encompassing moral collapse that involves some objective catastrophe. When Pyrrhus decides to reject Andromache and go back to Hermione, he confides to Phoenix:

> What Ruin have I shunn'd? ...
> ... while I
> Abandon'd Duty, Empire, Honour, All,
> To please a thankless Woman!
> (Page 21)

He has a Duty to love Hermione, but he is a creature of his Passions and allows himself to fall in love with his captive queen. Pyrrhus' love for Andromache seems wholly admirable and generous, except for an understandable impatience, and he even refuses to head off Hermione's schemes because "A nobler Passion takes up all my Thought" (p. 42). But actually, Philips wants us to understand that this passion is as fatal as any other. Phoenix's statement of the dangers is so forceful that immediate action and not grand talk about noble passions is required. In case the point is not adequately made in this scene, Phoenix stays onstage for a short soliloquy to explain the king's tragic flaw:

> I fear this Whirl of Passion ...
> That over-bears Reflection and cool Thought.
> (Page 43)

There is no real difference between his Passion and that of Hermione or Orestes except that he feels sure of attaining his goal, and so feels

not Rage but a fatal overconfidence. Earlier, like Hermione, he too wavered between Love and Rage (see p. 116 above).

The power of his Passion, and his inability to triumph over it, is further stressed in the final visit to Hermione. In the French, he callously explains why he is jilting her and why both should be delighted by this turn of events. In the English, the king has quite a different purpose; too proud to sneak off into marriage without visiting her personally, too conscious of his wronging her to avoid an apology, he plainly and almost contritely states his moral failure.

> The Gods can witness, Madam, how I fought
> Against *Andromache's* too fatal Charms!
> And still I wish I had the Power to leave
> This *Trojan* Beauty, and be just to you.
> (Page 40)

His calling on the gods shows he is serious when he asks her to upbraid him unsparingly for his "Crime." But Hermione, immediately thrown into a Rage, sees his penitence as brazenness and loses her temper much as in Racine. Penitence without reform only makes a situation worse.

If Passion triumphs over Pyrrhus' better impulses, he still remains more than partly sympathetic. The same is true of Hermione. After all, her grievance against Pyrrhus makes a desire for vengeance seem reasonable and just. But she has a better nature too that threatens the vindictiveness of her Rage. When ordering the death of Pyrrhus, she says to Orestes, "Give me not time to think" (p. 37), because a minimum of reflection will show her the wickedness of her actions. She loves the king so much that she may yet relapse into forgiveness. Orestes, in his turn, has a strong revulsion against the deed, and might refuse outright if he were not driven on also by frustrated Rage and a desire to gratify the object of his Passion. Thus his failure to commit the crime appears not as another evidence of weakness but as a highly moral unwillingness to betray a monarch. Even Hermione in her death is not completely without good impulses.

> She raised her Eyes to Heaven with such a Look,
> As spoke her Sorrows and reproach'd the Gods;
> (Page 54)

If Fate had been only a little more solicitous of her welfare, the whole catastrophe might have been averted.

Under what circumstances might these characters have been real villains? Hermione explains when Orestes returns with the fatal news.

> My Heart, though full of Rage, was free from Malice;
> And all my Anger was Excess of Love.
> (Page 52)

This sums up the moral argument neatly. She is just a headstrong, irresponsible girl who flies off the handle and says things she shouldn't. Orestes should have realized that the freedom of her heart from malice made her demand absurd; it was just part of a tantrum. If she had masterminded a plot in which Orestes had been forced to serve, that would have been malicious. As it was, he should have followed his own counsel. He did not, because his heart was equally full of Rage from a similarly unrequited excess of love. When he finds out that Hermione is dead, and his love never can be requited, his Rage now turns against himself and drives him to Distraction. Thus the three main characters who meet catastrophe fail in similar ways; they cannot control their Passions. And all three, in the worst of their deeds, avoid villainy and retain our respect.

But Andromache triumphs. And, just as the other characters come to grief because of their moral shortcomings, and in spite of brilliant promise at the beginning of the play, so Andromache succeeds because her character is without flaw. Her Passions are so completely sublimated into Love that anger in her case will never become Rage but only Righteous Indignation, which is blameless. Obviously, if she is to be gloriously vindicated, the reticent procedure of Racine, who never brings her onstage in the last act, must be changed.[5] And her triumph will shine at last more brilliantly if it is set against a rising action of deepest foreboding. Whereas in Racine Andromaque merely says, "Allons sur son tombeau consulter mon époux" (III, viii, 1048), Philips builds up a gloomy speech about a "Sad Monument" raised to "Hector's Shade," where in a sacred urn the "dear Remains" are enclosed.

> Oh! may he rise in Pity from his Tomb,
> And fix his wretched Son's uncertain Doom.
> (Page 34)

Doom here is a noncommittal word meaning "fate," but the connotations are horribly dark.

Philips also observes that Racine runs through the sensational disclosures of Andromaque (in IV, i) far too quickly. In the adaptation there is much more "suspense." First Andromache expresses a desire to see her son "once more." Some great struggle seems to be working within her, but she will not do more than give vague hints. At the end of the fourth act, the two women are brought back to exchange more mysterious questions and answers. After Cephisa is nearly driven mad

[5] The 1668 and 1673 editions of *Andromaque* introduce the heroine in chains in the course of the last act. She has been seized by the Greeks, but her son has escaped, and will rule. Whether or not Philips saw this version, his own revamping is of a fundamentally different nature.

with curiosity, Andromache finally reveals her plan. Here Philips' motivation becomes difficult. His heroine clearly cannot be such a fanatic as Racine's Andromaque, who feels she is committing a capital crime in even assenting to a marriage ceremony with Pyrrhus. An English audience could hardly endorse such a severe reading of infidelity. Likewise, references to Hector have to be kept within reasonable limits. It is hard to sympathize with a woman who continually prefers a dead husband to a live one. Consequently Andromache announces that she will commit suicide because she has "no farther Use for life" and also to "conclude her Woes." But for this middle-class heroine, there is less hand-wringing despondency than a businesslike calculation of risks:

> No other Stratagem can serve my Purpose:
> This is the sole Expedient, to be Just...
> (Page 45)

> Voilà de mon amour l'innocent stratagème;
> (IV, i, 1097)

Love, confusing in the context of the adaptation, has to be replaced by justice, innocence by expediency. To balance this decline in values, the English Andromache takes two pages to contemplate her sacrifice, which takes on the nobility of a vicarious atonement:

> My Soul o'erflows in Fondness!—Let him know,
> I dy'd to save him:— —and would dye again.
> (Page 46)

Her virtue is so dazzling that she may herself call attention to it, without the necessity of a modest restraint. And, if some of her "innocent stratagems" are flavored with a bourgeois opportunism, the English heroine does not have so delicate a stomach in these matters as her French counterpart.

> Speak of our Marriage: Let him think I lov'd him.
> (Page 46)

> Fais-lui valoir l'hymen où je me suis rangée;
> (IV, i, 1109)

In the last act Pyrrhus, Hermione, and Orestes meet the ends they might have avoided by prudence and self-control; then the catastrophe is over, and Andromache bursts in at the head of her troops for a scene of triumph and apotheosis. In two pages she runs the gamut of the virtuous emotions. First, she curses the treachery of the Greeks, as it behooves the widow of an assassinated monarch to do; then, after reading a short funeral oration over the corpse of Pyrrhus, she remembers to add, "While I live, my Tears / Will never cease" (p. 56), which helps

once more to focus attention on her own pathos. With this transition to the domestic note, Astyanax is forthwith announced, and she immediately exclaims about the "Extasie, that Mothers only feel." Of course her son cannot be brought onstage, since the Distrest Mother brooks no competition with mere children at this point. After Andromache expresses her gratitude to Heaven, the curtain may descend. She is saved, and Rage, Passion, and overconfident Ambition have all gone to Ruin. Virtue is its own reward.

The assumption need not be made that the dramatist consciously plotted his moral terminology to constitute a kind of "symphonic imagery." The consistency of the play is more fundamental. The conspicuous terms, like "Virtue" and "Ruin," were basic to the sentimental attitude; they were the terms in which Philips thought, so essential to him that he could only approach Racine through them, and that part of Racine that could not be classified in their terms could be relinquished without concern. To Philips, these abstractions were the faith by which one lived, and they justified any simplification of Racine's complexities, any smoothing over of unmentionable truth, any evasion of vice. The triumph of art was irrelevant without the triumph of virtue.

University College, New York University

CALVIN S. BROWN

Balzac as a Source Of George Moore's *Sister Teresa*

READERS of George Moore are aware of how much Balzac meant to him. Moore not only referred to Balzac in his fiction (five pages are devoted to a eulogy of him in *Evelyn Innes*[1]), but discussed him in various critical works, and gave a lecture on him (in French), which he published in several different forms. And on several occasions Moore specifically acknowledged that in one or another of his works he was consciously imitating or following Balzac.[2] In *Confessions of a Young Man,* he gives a concise statement of the relationship:

> Of those I have loved deeply there is but one that still may thrill me with the old passion, with the first ecstasy—it is Balzac. Upon that rock I built my church, and his great and valid talent saved me often from destruction, saved me from the shoaling waters of new aestheticisms, the putrid mud of naturalism, and the faint and sickly surf of the symbolists [IX, 368].

Strangely enough, however, one important and clear case of Balzac's influence on Moore seems to have been entirely overlooked—the influence of *La Duchesse de Langeais* on *Sister Teresa* (1901), the concluding half of the life of a Wagnerian soprano begun in *Evelyn Innes* (1898). In the earlier novel, Evelyn Innes runs away to Paris with Sir Owen Asher, who takes her for his mistress and finances her vocal training. She becomes the greatest of all Wagnerian singers, but, having been brought up a strict Catholic, is never really easy about her relationship with Sir Owen—especially after the music of *Tristan und Isolde* has thrown her into the arms of the young Celtic mystic and

[1] *The Collected Works of George Moore,* Carra ed. (New York, 1923), VI, 135-140. Unless otherwise stated, all citations of Moore are to this edition.

[2] For a good summary of Balzac's influence on Moore, see Georges Paul Collet, *George Moore et la France* (Geneva, 1957), pp. 173-187.

composer Ulick Dean. Under the influence of a forceful and tactful churchman, she makes a retreat in a convent which she had once visited as an adolescent girl. The first novel ends after this retreat. In *Sister Teresa* Evelyn's struggle reaches a crisis, and she enters the religious life, though with recurrent temptations and doubts as to her vocation. She even considers flight after she has taken her final vows, but at the end of the novel she is at peace as an obviously permanent nun.

Near the end of Balzac's *Honorine,* the heroine writes, as a sort of final comment on her life, "Je suis une sainte Thérèse qui n'a pu se nourrir d'extases, au fond d'un couvent avec le divin Jésus, avec un ange irréprochable, ailé, pour venir et pour s'enfuir à propos."[3] Honorine had let herself be persuaded to return to a good husband whom she did not love, and whom she had left in remorse because she had a lover; but playing the hypocritical role of loving wife and mother was too much for her honest nature, and the strain finally killed her. Because of her reference to Saint Teresa, she has been considered as the prototype, or at least the original suggestion, for Moore's treatment of the latter part of Evelyn Innes' career in *Sister Teresa.*[4] There is doubtless some truth in this, but the influence of *La Duchesse de Langeais* is far more important and specific.

In the beginning of that work, Armand de Montriveau, liberating a Mediterranean island, visits a Carmelite convent. For five years he has been seeking a lost love, and he is convinced that she has fled to a convent. During the service he recognizes the nun who plays the organ as French: the music she plays shows the influence of Rossini, and she inserts into the *Te Deum* "des motifs qui respirèrent toute la délicatesse du goût parisien, et auxquels se mêlèrent vaguement les pensées de nos plus beaux airs nationaux" (V, 129-130). She even works in a drawing-room romance, *Fleuve de Tage,* which has particular associations for Armand and the woman he is seeking. When he hears her sing, he positively identifies the nun as his Antoinette. Though it is against the rules, he, as liberator of the island, is allowed an interview with this young French nun, through the grill and in the presence of the Mother Superior—who knows no French. But Antoinette, now Sœur Thérèse, tells him that she is dead to the world and to love; when he tries to plead with her, she brings the interview to an instantaneous end by telling the Mother Superior who he is.

The central part of the novelette goes back to tell how Antoinette had trifled with Armand's affections until he determined on revenge, and

[3] Balzac, *La Comédie humaine,* ed. de la Pléiade, II, 316. All citations of Balzac are to this edition.

[4] Collet, *op. cit.,* pp. 183-184.

how she realized too late that she really loved him, and then disappeared into the convent. At the end, the story returns to the convent. Armand engineers an elaborate convent-delivery—he is one of *Les Treize,* to whom nothing is impossible—but, when he finally gets to her cell, he finds there her dead body awaiting burial. Only the opening and closing scenes, in the convent, have any bearing on Moore.

Taking the veil as an escape from an insoluble amorous problem is such a time-honored device, both in life and in fiction, that no source need be sought for it; and the women who take this step in Balzac and Moore differ in that Antoinette became a nun because she mistakenly thought herself despised by her lover, whereas Evelyn Innes was fleeing the carnality of her own nature. It is only in the light of later events that we can say that the duchess has any bearing on Evelyn Innes' destiny.

The most obvious connection between the two characters is the identity of their religious names. We are given no reason why Antoinette assumed the name of Sœur Thérèse. Evelyn's religious name, on the other hand, is elaborately prepared. When she made her retreat near the end of *Evelyn Innes,* she discovered in the convent library Saint Teresa's *Way of Perfection* and *Book of her Life,* and Moore devotes eight pages (pp. 507-515) to quoting extracts from these books and telling how much they impressed his heroine. Later, Mother Hilda selected the name for Evelyn because of this particular devotion (*Sister Teresa,* p. 149).

Moore ingeniously adapts Balzac's device of having his heroine located by her musical performance. In Balzac, the voice confirms Armand's suspicion that the organist is his Antoinette. Sir Owen Asher does not try to locate Evelyn and abduct her from the convent—one can conceive of such goings-on in the Balearic Isles, or even in Paris (as in the scandal which was Balzac's source), but obviously not in Wimbledon. But the recognition motive is too good to be passed up. Accordingly, Evelyn is made to sing Schubert's *Ave Maria* beautifully at one of the convent's services open to the public, and to move one of the men present to tears, as Antoinette's singing in the convent had moved Armand (*Sister Teresa,* pp. 103-105). Later, Evelyn is visited by Louise Helbrun, the only fellow opera singer she has ever really liked. When Evelyn asks, "Tell me how you found me out," Louise answers, "I was singing Schubert's *Ave Maria,* and a man told me he had heard a nun at Wimbledon sing it more beautifully than anyone—myself, of course, excepted. Something told me it was you, and the moment I heard you I knew" (pp. 157-158).

Two other similarities are perhaps significant. The arrangement of the convent church, with the public section separated by a grill from

the section reserved for the nuns, is perhaps too necessary to bear much weight in a question of literary influence; but, though there are no direct verbal echoes, there is enough similarity between the descriptions in *La Duchesse de Langeais* (p. 127) and *Evelyn Innes* (p. 385) to suggest that Moore may have had at least some latent recollection of Balzac's account while writing his own. More significant is a nightmare which Evelyn has as a culmination of a period of theological doubt. Sir Owen was an atheist, and had tried hard to wean her away from her religious upbringing, but she never succeeded in really throwing it off, even temporarily. In this nightmare Evelyn, now a nun, dreams that Sir Owen has sneaked into the convent and found her, and that the two of them have slipped unseen into the chapel and hidden there during Mass, intending to steal the Host and commit sacrilege on it (*Sister Teresa,* pp. 230-232). The entire tone and atmosphere of this nightmare are reminiscent of the scene at the end of *La Duchesse de Langeais* (pp. 253-254) in which *Les Treize* break into the convent at night, only to find Antoinette a corpse.

Balzac's Antoinette became a very strict Carmelite, Moore's Evelyn a Passionist. Yet it is interesting and perhaps significant that Carmelites keep turning up in the background of Evelyn Innes' history. When she made a retreat as a yong girl, the meditations were led by a Carmelite monk (*Evelyn Innes,* p. 40), and Evelyn herself owns a scapular of Our Lady of Mount Carmel (*Evelyn Innes,* p. 417). The Carmelite monk reappears in *Sister Teresa* as Father Ambrose (p. 112). When Evelyn was hesitating over her own decision, she went with her maid Merat to see the maid's cousin take the veil as a Carmelite nun (*Sister Teresa,* pp. 30-33), and this event profoundly moved her. After her own final vows she remembered the scene, and reflected that this girl's "renunciation of the world had been much more complete than hers had been that morning. For the order of the Carmelites was more severe than that of the Passionists" (*Sister Teresa,* p. 155).

This last sentence probably explains why, in spite of the constant references to Carmelites, Moore made Evelyn Innes become a Passionist. He could not tell his story as he wanted to unless there was considerable opportunity for conversation and personal relationships in the convent. (Balzac does not try to tell the story of Antoinette's five years as Sœur Thérèse.) Even more important is the matter of music. Evelyn renounced the stage, but she helped the convent by her singing, and the shift from art for human enjoyment to art for devotion (leading finally to what is essentially a rejection of art) is an important part of her story.

It has been pointed out that Balzac is at the least careless in this matter of music. "L'ignorance de Balzac, au sujet des règles si rigides de

l'ordre du Carmel, lui a fait commettre des erreurs d'une invraisemblance criante. La musique n'existe pas chez les Carmélites et leurs offices sont psalmodiés sur trois notes immuablement fixées."[5] The *Te Deum* in the form of a fantasia on French airs and the coloratura singing of Sœur Thérèse are quite impossible—but such an impossibility would trouble Balzac very little. Moore, however, had greater care for such details, and the religious ideal is also an essential element in his story; hence he could not use a convent merely as a sort of *coup de théâtre*. Furthermore, he doubtless knew a good deal more about such matters than did Balzac. Hence he kept the Carmelite background, but put his singer into an order where she could legitimately sing.

There is an interesting complication in the fact that Balzac apparently based the convent episode of *La Duchesse de Langeais* on a Parisian scandal involving the Norman poet Ulric Guttinguer, who followed his mistress from Rouen to Paris and vainly tried to get her out of a convent.[6] He was able to see her only at public services; when, on Easter Sunday, 1828, he at last realized that she was really happy as a nun, he withdrew his unwanted attentions and himself underwent a religious conversion. Guttinguer and Sainte-Beuve began collaborating on a novel based on this experience, with Guttinguer supplying the material and Sainte-Beuve doing most of the actual writing, but the work was never finished. Guttinguer, however, wrote a version of his own, entitled *Arthur,* which appeared anonymously and obscurely in Rouen in 1834 (*La Duchesse de Langeais* is dated January of that year), and in a much revised version in Paris two years later.[7] The Parisian version cuts the convent episode to one short chapter and concentrates on the frustrated lover's subsequent conversion.

Guttinguer's books obviously did not influence Balzac, who drew on the events themselves, which were well known in Paris at the time. Sainte-Beuve's fragment never gets as far as the convent, but breaks off before—apparently immediately before—the original seduction. It was not published until 1901,[8] the same year as *Sister Teresa.* (A large part of *Sister Teresa* had been written before the publication of *Evelyn Innes* in 1898; it was merely because the length was getting out of hand that a work which had been planned as a single novel was published as two separate books.)[9]

[5] Georges Thouvenin, "La Composition de 'La Duchesse de Langeais,'" *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France,* XLVII, 346.

[6] *Ibid.* This is a good general account and documentation of the affair.

[7] The Parisian version of 1836 is readily accessible, with an introduction and notes by Henri Bremond, in the edition of Les Presses Françaises (Paris, 1925).

[8] In Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, *Sainte-Beuve inconnu* (Paris, 1901), pp. 3-129.

[9] See Moore's preface to the revised edition of *Sister Teresa* (London, 1909).

Improbable as it is that either Balzac or Moore could have known Sainte-Beuve's fragment, there is one passage in the fragment that presents a striking coincidence. Sainte-Beuve has Arthur (the name used for Ulric Guttinguer in both Ulric's and Sainte-Beuve's versions) comment, after a mention of certain feelings that he cannot and will not disclose:

> La musique seule, avec ses vapeurs et ses voiles, et la profonde douceur de ses soupirs, une musique de carmélites allemandes, chantant le soir, derrière la grille d'une cloitre, au chœur d'une basilique, serait digne de toucher, sans dissonance ni souillure, à ce sentiment qui n'est rencontré qu'une fois, à ce qui n'a été véritablement en nous qu'un éclair, un accord indéfinissable, une mélodie.[10]

Here, apparently as a foreshadowing of the convent scenes which Sainte-Beuve never wrote, is the whole complex of cloister, grill, music, and Carmelites. Balzac could not have known this passage unless he read Sainte-Beuve's manuscript. Moore could not have used it unless he saw the manuscript, for it is already present in *Evelyn Innes*. The resemblance must be coincidence, and yet it seems too close to be accidental. Perhaps it is best considered as an illustration of the ancient observation that "it is probable that many things should happen contrary to probability."[11]

But the evidence for Moore's use of *La Duchesse de Langeais* is beyond the possibility of mere coincidence. In *Evelyn Innes* Sir Owen tells Evelyn about Balzac and his works. She asks whether she reminds Sir Owen of any character in Balzac, and at first he thinks of Lucien de Rubempré. When he tries to think of a female character, he tentatively suggests Honorine, and briefly summarizes her story. Then he adds:

> But I can't place *Honorine* very high among Balzac's works. There are beautiful touches in it, but I think he failed to realise the type. You are more virile, more real to me than Honorine. No; on the whole, Balzac has not done you. He perceived you dimly. If he had lived it might, it certainly would, have been otherwise. There is, of course, the Duchesse Langeais. There is something of you in her; but she is no more than a brilliant sketch, no better than Honorine [pp. 139-140].

At the end of the preface to the revised version of *Sister Teresa*,[12] Moore says that, in writing the book, "I may have done no more than to realise one of [Balzac's] most famous characters." A recent critic[13] implies that perhaps this may be connected wtih the remarks already quoted about Honorine's being a frustrated Saint Teresa. Actually, there is no such connection. Moore had just mentioned Balzac's *Le*

[10] Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
[11] Aristotle, *Poetics*, XVIII, 6.
[12] In The Adelphi Library (London, 1909).
[13] Collet, *op. cit.*, pp. 183-184.

Chef-d'œuvre inconnu, in which a painter reworked a painting until it became an incomprehensible mess; and he means that perhaps he has "realised" Balzac's painter by ruining his own novel in the reworking. This remark is amply justified by the judgment of posterity; for the original version is the one which has been generally read and reprinted.

In a way, however, the revised version gives some support to the influence of *La Duchesse de Langeais*. The discovery of Evelyn's retreat by means of her music is abandoned, and the nightmare scene disappears. Collet suggests that one of Moore's purposes in revising *A Modern Lover* and *A Drama in Muslin* was to get rid of the imitations of Balzac, and Moore himself states that this constituted a considerable part of the revision of *A Mummer's Wife*.[14] The disappearance of these episodes from the later version of *Sister Teresa* is a sort of confirmation of the hypothesis that they were originally suggested by and imitated from Balzac.

University of Georgia

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 177, 180.

GEORGE FENWICK JONES

Lov'd I Not Honour More: The Durability Of a Literary Motif

THE PURPOSE of this study is to ascertain what Richard Lovelace meant by the word "honour" in the much-quoted couplet: "I could not love thee, dear, so much / Lov'd I not honour more."[1] Although the *New English Dictionary* cites the passage as an early example of honor in its modern meaning of noble sentiment or character, I shall show that Lovelace probably used the word in its older sense of reputation or good name.[2]

The difficulty of ascertaining his intent lies in the fact that English, like most other European languages, now uses a single noun "honor" to express two different ideas. The vocable *honor* actually includes two separate nouns, nouns which are distinct even though they share a common spelling, pronunciation, and origin. These two nouns do not merely connote different degrees or aspects of one thing; rather they are distinct homonyms expressing dissimilar concepts, just as the nouns "door" and "door." In the sentence, "He ran right through the door," the word "door" means something different from what it

[1] "To Lucasta. Going to the Warres." All quotations from *Lucasta*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt (London, 1864).

[2] I do not agree that Lovelace used "honour" in the sense of *NED* honour, 2. "Personal title to high respect or esteem; honorableness, elevation of character; 'nobleness of mind, scorn of meanness, magnanimity'; a fine sense of and strict allegiance to what is due or right (also, to what is due according to some conventional or fashionable standard of conduct)." I believe he used the word in the sense of *NED* honour, 1. "High respect, esteem, or reverence, accorded to exalted worth or rank; deferential admiration or approbation. c. As received, gained, held, or enjoyed: Glory, renown, fame; credit, reputation, good name. The opposite of *dishonour, disgrace.*"

means in the sentence, "The door was made of heavy oak panels reinforced with iron bands." At least we hope so, for the sake of the one who ran through it.

When we say, "He is a man of honor," honor means an inner quality of soul or character, a nice sense of right and wrong. On the other hand, when we say, "He is a scoundrel; yet he enjoys great honor because of his wealth," the word honor refers to an exterior possession, namely the respect, admiration, or opinion of other people. Since public esteem need not be merited, it is obvious that honor in the first sense is quite unlike honor in the second sense. "Subjective" and "objective" honor are different concepts, even if they can be expressed by a single vocable.

Inability to recognize this semantic change is responsible for our expression, "Poor but honest people,"[3] which would imply that the rich are usually more honest than the poor in spite of what Scripture says about the difficulties encountered by rich men and camels. The expression is clearly a holdover from the day when "honest" meant "respected," from an age when only the rich were normally honored and when poor people were respected only if exceptionally virtuous.[4] Fortunately this time-worn cliché seems at last to be losing ground.[5]

In order to discover what Lovelace meant by honor in his couplet, we must observe that he was writing in accord with an ancient, yet ever modern, literary tradition, that of the struggle between love and honor, in which the word "honor" was conventionally used to designate reputation or good name. First we shall survey the evolution of the concept of honor in its original or objective sense, especially the sense of military glory. Then we shall see that it was a literary convention for noble heroes to have to choose between this worthy goal and the enticements of love, be it carnal or spiritual. Finally we shall observe how, under Stoic influence, the concept of honor assumed an additional and transferred meaning of integrity, or loyalty to an inner moral law. It will be apparent that the new and deeper meaning of honor never entered the age-old motif of love versus honor and cannot have been the value intended by Lovelace.

[3] "My friends were poor, but honest" still had meaning in Shakespeare's *All's Well that Ends Well* (I, iii, v. 203).

[4] Nicolas Faret, who defined the honest man in his *L'Honneste Homme, ou l'Art de Plaire à la Cour* a few years before *Lucasta*, said that an honest man had to be of noble birth and had to excel in various leisure-class sports. If it had not been assumed that poverty is a disgrace, no one would have said "Armut ist keine Schande." Poverty, like defeat, was proof of lack of virtue or of divine grace.

[5] Thomas Wolfe has modernized this cliché: "Jarvis Riggs, the banker, had come from a poor but thoroughly respectable family in the town." *You Can't Go Home Again* (New York, 1942), p. 360.

For the ancient Romans the word *honor* (or *honos*) referred to the awe, respect, or deference shown to the gods or to people of superior rank, power, wealth, courage, or success.[6] In this sense it was the equivalent of the Greek τιμή, which was likewise considered the worthiest incentive for human endeavor.[7] Both the Athenians and the Romans believed that the highest honors should be accorded to those who best served the state, particularly through military service,[8] and agreed that the most virtuous man was the one with the greatest desire for fame (*φιλοτιμία, gloriae cupiditas*).[9]

This concept of honor is similar to that of the ancient Teutons, if we may trust the testimony of Caesar, Tacitus, and early Teutonic literature. Among the barbarians, honor was shown chiefly to kings and successful warlords and to brave and faithful followers. Both Caesar and Tacitus tell how the Teutons fell into the greatest disgrace by failing to fight when called upon. According to Caesar's *Gallic War* (VI, 23), if a volunteer refused to make good his promise to fight, he was branded as a renegade and traitor, and confidence in his sincerity was forever afterwards shaken. Tacitus relates in his *Germania* that traitors and deserters were hanged on trees and that cowards and shirkers were drowned in bogs under wattled hurdles (Chap. 12). However, such punishment was not always necessary, because many survivors of lost battles hanged themselves rather than live a life of ignominy and shame (Chap. 6). As David Riesman says of a tradition-directed society, "sanction for behavior tends to be the fear of being shamed."[10]

The Anglo-Saxon epic *Beowulf* gives a striking and typical account of the ignominy suffered by a shirker. After Beowulf has fallen, his faithful follower Wiclaf reproaches the other warriors for having failed their lord in his time of need. "Now all treasure-sharing and all pride of ownership will be lost to your kinships. Every member of your families will have to wander bereft of the law of the land as soon as noblemen far and wide have heard of your flight, your infamous deed. For a nobleman, death is better than a shameful life."[11] Not only the culprits but also their descendants will be without honor or legal rights.

For centuries such sentiments were frequently expressed in Ger-

[6] See Friedrich Klose, *Die Bedeutung von homos und honestas,* Diss. Breslau (Breslau, 1933), pp. 10, 13, 19, 29, 44, *et passim.*

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] See Aristotle, *Ethics,* IV, 3; I, 5. Also, Joseph Eckstein, *Die Ehre in Philosophie und Recht* (Leipzig, 1889), pp. 14-16.

[9] Plato (*Laws,* XI, 921) had argued that honors are the soldier's proper wage.

[10] *The Lonely Crowd* (New York, 1951), p. 40.

[11] *Beowulf,* ed. F. Klaeber (Boston, 1936), vv. 2884-91.

manic literature, as well as in the Romance literatures of those lands once ruled by Germanic invaders. The scorn of shirkers was just as pronounced in the *chansons de geste* as it had been in the earlier heroic sagas. Failure to fight for one's liege lord was attributed to cowardice, regardless of extenuating circumstances. Both Bernier in *Raoul of Cambrai* and Rüdiger in the *Lay of the Nibelungs* are accused of cowardice when they hesitate to fight against their kinsmen.

The importance of a warrior's good name has lasted undiminished down to modern times. The old scorn against slackers could still be convincingly presented early in this century, for example in Arthur Mason's *The Four Feathers*. The hero of this novel, as a boy, heard some former officers discuss the fate of a young officer named Wilmington, who had refused to obey his general's order to carry a message across three hundred yards of bullet-swept ground in the Crimean War. "But it was a tragic business for Wilmington. He was broken, of course, and slunk back to London. Every house was closed to him; he dropped out of his circle like a lead bullet you let slip out of your hand into the sea. The very women in Picadilly spat if he spoke to them; and he blew his brains out in a back bedroom off the Haymarket."[12] Here we see the old values expressed in the *Germania* and in *Beowulf* surviving intact for fully two centuries after Lovelace wrote his "To Lucasta." The only advance over the Teutons of the *Germania* was that the coward ended his shame with a pistol instead of a rope.

The importance of a warrior's reputation was proverbial. Before there were official fitness reports, a warrior's worth could be judged only by what people said about him; mediaeval fighting men had an almost paranoid obsession that people were trying to smear their good names, and a warrior would go to any length to free himself of suspicion. Perhaps one of the most beautiful expressions of indignation at injured honor is found in the opening scene of Shakespeare's *Richard II*, when Norfolk, whose feudal loyalty has been impugned, implores his liege to let him defend his honor in a trial by combat.

> The purest treasure mortal times afford
> Is spotless reputation; that away,
> Men are but gilded loam or painted clay . . .
> Mine honour is my life; both grow in one;
> Take honour from me, and my life is done:
> Then, dear my liege, mine honour let me try;
> In that I live and for that will I die.

Obviously the word "honour" in this passage refers to reputation or "objective" honor; for, as philosophers have long contended, no one

[12] New York, 1903, p. 8.

can take away another man's inner honor. However, honor was no less important because it was external, even if most of us today would tend to agree with Falstaff's skepticism concerning it.[13] Bernier, Rüdiger, and Norfolk were as ready to die for their good names as any modern hero is ready to die for his inner convictions. Throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance and down into modern times, the flower of European nobility gladly risked and often lost their lives in so-called "affairs of honor."

Let us now see how honor conflicted with love, another great motif and motivation in literature. From earliest times philosophers and writers have looked upon indolent self-indulgence, particularly lechery, as the greatest foe of martial virtue. Plato all but banished sex from his ideal state and relegated it to its reproductive function; and in his *Laws* he claimed that Iccus of Tarentum owed his athletic victories to his sexual continence.[14] Both Caesar and Tacitus reflected the same viewpoint in their praise of the continence of Germanic youths, who preserved their vigor by mating late.[15]

The choice between love and military renown has been a favorite theme in world literature. An early example is found in the *Iliad*, when uxorious Paris is contrasted unfavorably with virtuous Hector, who subordinates his marital to his martial nature. Finding Paris at home with his beautiful wife instead of in battle, Hector rebukes him for shirking; and Helen, who has been trying to shame her recreant husband into battle, tells Hector that she wishes she were the wife of "some better man that felt the indignation of men and their many reproachings."[16] Later, when Hector's own wife, Andromache, tries to dissuade him from returning to the fray, he answers: "All these things are in my mind also, lady; yet I would feel deep shame before the Trojans, and the Trojan women with trailing garments, if like a coward I were to shrink aside from the fighting, and the spirit will not let me, since I have learned to be valiant and to fight always among the foremost ranks of the Trojans, winning for my own self great glory, and for my father."[17] His motivation was the same as that of Bernier and Rüdiger —fear of shame and hope of renown.

The behavior of Paris and Hector reminds us of Prodicus' tale of the choice of Heracles, as recorded in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. Upon

[13] "Can honour set to a leg? ... What is honour? A word ... Honour is a mere scutcheon ..." *Henry IV*, Part One, V, 1.

[14] *Laws*, VIII, 840.

[15] *Gallic War*, VI, 21; *Germania*, chap. 20.

[16] *Iliad*, VI, 350-351; trans. Walter Leaf and M. A. Bayfield (London, 1923), p. 398.

[17] *The Iliad of Homer*, trans. R. Lattimore (Chicago, 1952), VI, 440-446.

reaching manhood, Heracles had to choose between two ladies, one representing Vice (Κακία) and the other Virtue ('Αρετή), one promising luxury and indolence, the other toil and effort. The hero chooses Virtue rather than be an outcast of the gods and the scorn of men and die forgotten and dishonored instead of sung and remembered.[18] Since it was conventional to contrast the worthy warrior and the worthless lover, it is clear that Ovid was being facetious when he likened them in his *Amores* (I, ix) and created the fiction that their campaigns were of equal merit.

Just as many ancient philosophers thought that sexual pleasures debilitated men and robbed them of their honor, so the Church Fathers taught that carnal love was a danger to men's souls, especially since it led to lechery and sloth (*luxuria* and *desidia*), two of the deadly sins. Even marital love was a danger, for "he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife" (1 Cor., 7:33). Both pagan-classic and Christian-ascetic traditions appear frequently in mediaeval literature, often side by side. The pagan tradition is evident, for example, in the ninth-century late-Latin epic *Waltharius*. When Attila tries to bind Walther to his service by persuading him to marry, Walther answers: "If I take a bride according to the command of my lord, I shall at once be chained by cares and by love for the girl and I shall often be hindered from my service to the king. I shall be compelled to build houses and cultivate the fields, and this will prevent me from being present in the sight of my lord and devoting my customary attention to the kingdom of the Huns. For if anyone tastes pleasure [*voluptatem*], he will henceforth find it intolerable to bear hardships."[19]

Lechery, rather than marital felicity, is contrasted with martial ardor in the *Gesta Danorum* of Saxo Grammaticus. In one of his national sagas Saxo tells how a hero named Hjalte left the embrace of a wench to come to the aid of his king as soon as he heard the sound of fighting in the palace: "Preferring courage to lechery, he chose to seek the deadly dangers of Mars rather than indulge in the alluring enticements of Venus."[20] After cutting off his sweetheart's nose to mar her beauty, he hastens back to the palace to awaken the king's retainers. While waking them, he waxes eloquent in a long harangue on the advantages of winning glory in battle rather than shame in love making.[21] In the

[18] *Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*, trans. E. C. Marchant, Loeb Classical Library (New York, 1923), *Memorabilia*, II, 1, 21-33.

[19] *Waltharius*, ed. Karl Strecker, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetae* VI, No. 1, vv. 150-164.

[20] *Saxonis Grammatici, Gesta Danorum*, ed. A. Holder (Strassburg, 1886), p. 58, vv. 23-25.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 59, vv. 1-25.

Jómsvikings Saga a hero named Vigfús whets a spear while reciting a verse: "We have a fierce fight to expect; while the woman's friend lies at home, the fight approaches. I think that the one fond of women enjoys a warm spot under a woman's arms: we get our spears ready, he expects something different from battle."[22]

In contrast to his virtuous hero Hjalte, Saxo also tells of a king named Frode who won disgrace as a rover because his sailors were newly married and preferred the pleasures of the bed at home to labors of war abroad.[23] In view of Saxo's broad learning, it is very likely that he had studied in France, as had so many other scholars of his time. In any case it is probable, or at least possible, that he was familiar with Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Brittaniae*, which had followed a similar tradition by letting Cador, the Duke of Cornwall, warn King Arthur that, "where the use of weapons is seen to be absent and enticements [*inflammationes*] of dice and women and other amusements to be present, there is no doubt that whatever there was of virtue, honor, audacity, and fame will be besmirched by cowardice."[24] As the father of the Arthurian tradition, Geoffrey greatly influenced the thoughts and values of coming generations, especially after his ideas were popularized by Wace's *Le Roman de Brut*, a French paraphrase of the *Historia*. Wace also lets Cador warn the king that his subjects have become soft through too much peace. Because idleness decreases prowess, causes lechery, and ignites love affairs, the Britons are in danger of losing their good name.[25]

This tradition was further disseminated by Chrétien de Troyes in his two Arthurian epics, *Erec* and *Yvain*. Erec, the hero of the first, starts out as a perfect knight, one who puts his good name above all other considerations. But, after he wins a beautiful wife and becomes king, he is as infatuated with his wife Enide as Paris was with Helen and forgets his knightly calling. As Chrétien expresses it, "He loved her with such love that he no longer cared for weapons, nor did he go to tournaments. He no longer wished to joust but just fondled his wife. He made her his sweetheart and his mistress. He devoted all his heart and mind to hugging and kissing her, and he sought no other enjoyment. His companions were grieved about this, and they often complained to one another that he loved her so much. It was often past

[22] This literal prose version was kindly sent to me by Professor Lee M. Hollander. See his *The Saga of the Jómsvikings* (Austin, Tex., 1955), p. 97.

[23] *Gesta*, p. 216, vv. 17-18.

[24] *The Historia Regum Brittaniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth*, ed. A. Griscom (London, 1929), IX, 15.

[25] *Le Roman de Brut de Wace*, ed. Ivor Arnold (Paris, 1940), II, vv. 10,744-46.

noon before he arose from her side . . . "[26] So many people speak ill of (*blasmez*) him that Enide hears that he is recreant about weapons; and one morning, while he is sleeping beside her, she weeps upon remembering what people are saying about him.[27] When Erec learns her secret, he goes in quest of adventure, taking her along as his groom, and regains his good name by a series of spectacular victories.

Yvain, the hero of Chrétien's complementary romance, is warned before he loses his good name. Like Erec, he wins a winsome wife through his prowess and is therefore in danger of softening through his love for her. Fortunately, his friend Gauvain arrives in time to warn him of his danger. "What?" he asks, "Would you be one of those who are less worthy because of their wives? Cursed be he, by Saint Mary, who marries just to degenerate! Whoever has a beautiful woman as a mistress or wife should be better because of her. It is not right for her to love him except while his fame and praise last. Surely you too would be distressed with her love if you degenerated, because a woman soon withdraws her love from him who degenerates in any sort of way when he becomes king of the realm. Now your fame really ought to increase!"[28] Gauvain persuades Yvain to take leave of his wife for a year and accompany him to the tournaments. Hartman of Aue, a Swabian poet who rendered both of these romances into German, outdoes Chrétien in his description of the uxorious husbands,[29] and is even more complete and consistent in his casuistry of love and dialectics of honor.

This topos of the conflict between love and honor appeared in a myriad of versions and with a whole gamut of meanings—the conflict between military glory and lechery, between knightly reputation and uxoriousness, or even between bourgeois respectability and marital love. The last and most modern version appears, for example, in Ibsen's *The Doll's House*, when Helmer says to Nora, "I would gladly work for you day and night, Nora—bear sorrow and want for your sake. But no man sacrifices his honor [*ære*] even for the one he loves."[30]

While most ancient and many mediaeval writers looked upon women as a danger to men's honor, some looked upon them as stimulants to noble deeds, as Gauvain said they should be. As a true hero, Hector was reluctant to shirk from battle before the Trojan women, whereas Paris,

[26] *Kristian von Troyes Erec und Enide*, ed. W. Foerster (Halle, 1909), vv. 2434-47.

[27] *Ibid.*, vv. 2480-82.

[28] *Chrestien de Troyes Yvain*, ed. T. Reid (Manchester, 1948), vv. 2484-98.

[29] *Hartmann von Aue, Erec / Iwein*, ed. H. Naumann and H. Steinger (Leipzig, 1933). For uxorious husbands, see *Erec*, vv. 2924-98.

[30] "Men der er ingen, som ofrer sin ære for den man elsker." Henrik Ibsen, *Samlede Digterverker* (Oslo, 1937), IV, 205.

being a coward, could not be shamed into action even by his wife. In the eighth chapter of his *Germania*, Tacitus tells us how the Germanic women stood behind their men in battle and shamed them into greater effort, particularly by reminding them that defeat would mean captivity for the women. Hector himself said he would rather die than have his wife enslaved, so that people could say, "Look there is Hector's wife."[31] Just as the Trojans and Teutons fought harder because their women watched them, the knights of Geoffrey's Round Table jousted best when their ladies watched from the walls.[32] We have seen how Erec was shamed into action by Enide's tears and reproach.

This inspiration provided by women was another literary commonplace, often expressed by the same authors who warned against the dangers of immoderate love or uxoriousness. Geoffrey claimed that the ladies at Arthur's court would accept no man's love unless he had proved himself at least three times in battle.[33] Wace followed Geoffrey in this tradition; after Cador warns against the softening influence of love, Gauvain answers that conversations and love affairs are good and that friendship and pure loves make knights practice knighthood.[34] Like Geoffrey, Saxo also maintains that only the brave deserve the fair, as poets have claimed from time immemorial. He tells how a Hunnish princess once refused a Danish suitor because, "in olden days no one was considered suitable to marry an illustrious woman unless he won for himself great fame through the brilliance of his deeds. In a suitor sloth was the greatest vice. Nothing was damned more in a suitor than a lack of fame."[35] Elsewhere Saxo tells of a hero who has to fight a duel to prove his valor before he can win a wife.[36] A large part of mediaeval romance concerns knights errant who seek adventure to prove themselves worthy of their ladyloves.[37]

The ability of women to shame men into action is still a literary commonplace. In the previously mentioned novel, *The Four Feathers*, the heroine adds a fourth white feather to the three her fiancé has received from his comrades, who have learned that he left his regiment knowing it had been ordered to battle.

We have seen that, in literary conflicts between love and honor,

[31] *Iliad*, trans. Lattimore, VI, 459.
[32] *Historia*, IX, 14.
[33] *Ibid.*, IX, 13.
[34] *Roman de Brut*, vv. 10,769-71.
[35] *Gesta*, p. 124, vv. 1-3.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 194, vv. 14-17.
[37] This tradition is well illustrated by Wolfram's *Willehalm*, which lets not only the Christians but also the Saracens exert themselves largely for women's love and women's rewards.

honor was conventionally an external value. Although the word had, by Lovelace's day, acquired a secondary meaning of inner integrity, it is most unlikely that he used it in this sense in his famous couplet. From the twelfth century onwards the concept of true honor, at least among churchmen and didactic writers, had begun to show the influence of Stoic tradition, in which the word *honestum* was used to mean not only what is honored but also what should be honored, namely, that which is morally right. This new subjective meaning was transmitted by Cicero's *De Officiis*, a popular work throughout the Middle Ages. Cicero, who seems to have been the first to use the word *honestum* in this transferred sense, did so only in translating the Greek Stoics; elsewhere he used the word in its customary objective sense. From the *De Officiis* the new use of the word went into various mediaeval Latin textbooks and was reflected in many didactic and clerical works. But the new meaning did not displace the basic meaning of the word, even though *honestum*, in the sense of respectedness, did presuppose respectable behavior as well as wealth or social position. It is also to be noted that the new meaning first attached itself to the adjective *honestus* and its derivatives *honnête* and *honest*, and only much later to the nouns.[38] In the King James Bible, published some forty years before the "Lucasta," the noun *honor* appears only in an objective sense, while *honest* and *honestly* are used in the New Testament to refer to good (i.e., respectable) behavior and therefore may be said to have moral overtones.[39] According to C. L. Barber, the word *honor*, as used in English dramas during the seventeenth century, most often had objective meaning, particularly in the dramas written for the cavaliers.[40]

In thirteenth-century Germany the word *êre* was used to render not only *honos* but also *honestum*; and thus, among scholars, it acquired moral content as *honestum* acquired it. We have seen that a woman could shame a man into showing courage or manly virtue (*virtus*) in order to win glory (*honor*). As the words for virtue (*tugent*) and glory (*êre*) began to acquire moral meaning, the old commonplace began to

[38] As late as Lovelace's time Spanish dramatists used *honor* as a synonym of *fama*, and French dramatists used *honneur* as a synonym of *gloire*.

[39] See *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*, ed. Robert Young (Funk and Wagnals, New York, n.d.). The word "honest" in the King James Version usually renders Greek καλόν. The editors of the Revised Standard Version (New York, 1952) have changed "honest" to "noble" (Romans, 12:17), to "honorable" (2 Cor., 8:21, Phil., 4:8, and Hebrews, 13:18), to "good" (1 Peter, 2:12), and to "right" (2 Cor., 13:7). Likewise, "honesty" becomes "respectful life" (1 Tim., 2:2); "honestly" becomes "becomingly" (Romans, 13:13); and "to walk honestly" becomes "to command the respect of outsiders" (1 Thes., 4:12).

[40] C. L. Barber, *The Idea of Honour in the English Drama (1591-1700)* (Göteborg, 1957).

change its meaning in German literature, not only among the clerics but even among the secular court poets. Gottfried of Strassburg claimed that a woman's love could inspire a man to virtue and honor,[41] and Walther von der Vogelweide and many other poets claimed that a good woman's love will prevent a noble man from committing any misdeed.[42] Just as the ancient Germanic warriors had to win fame to be worthy of their loves, their late-mediaeval descendants had, at least in the eyes of the didactic writers, to live respectably in order to win theirs.[43] It could be argued that Lovelace expressed a similar thought when, in his epitaph for Mrs. Tilmer, he referred to virgins whose beauty led the young world to honor.[44] More probably, however, he meant that their beauty led young men to maintain their good names. Many clerics and bourgeois intellectuals, excluded from the honor code of the ruling classes, accepted the Stoic idea that true honor was inner integrity rather than public acclaim.[45] But, in spite of centuries of sermonizing, they could never weaken the aristocracy's primary concern for an untarnished reputation, as the long-lived custom of dueling proved.

As C. H. Hartmann has shown, Lovelace was a true cavalier.[46] As a cavalier he was the heir of an unbroken military tradition derived, via the Saxons and Normans, from ancient Germanic times—a military tradition, with its pagan code of honor sharpened by classical tradition and hardly affected by Christian teaching. And one would expect that he would show the idea of honor that belongs to that tradition. In any case, there is no evidence that Lovelace intended any new or ethical value in his use of the word "honour" in his famous couplet. And there is linguistic reason to doubt that he had any such intention, since the word "honour" and its derivatives appear elsewhere in *Lucasta* only with objective meaning. Naturally the verb "to honour" and the plural form of the noun "honours" can only be objective. Likewise, "honest" and "honourable" must be objective when applied to inanimate objects

[41] "Daz nieman âne ir lêre noch tugende hât noch êre." *Tristan*, vv. 190-91.

[42] "Swer guotes wibes minne hât, der schamt sich aller missetât." *Die Gedichte Walthers von der Vogelweide*, ed. C. v. Kraus (Leipzig, 1936), 93, 17-18.

[43] "Wer in frauen dienst ist, der muss sich aller missetat anen." *Johannes von Tepl, Der Ackerman*, ed. W. Krogmann (Wiesbaden, 1954) XXIX, v, 21. "Einer reinen frauen fingirdroen strafet und züchtiget vür alle waffen einen frumen man" (*ibid.*, v. 26). For other examples of this commonplace, see *ibid.*, p. 211.

[44] Ed. Hazlitt, p. 101.

[45] This idea was widely disseminated by Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, which was a popular text throughout the Middle Ages. Concerning other men's praise, Lady Philosophy asks, "And if they are justly won by merits, what can they add to the pleasure of a wise man's conscience; for he measures his happiness not by popular talk, but by the truth of his conscience."

[46] C. H. Hartmann, *The Cavalier Spirit and Its Influence on the Life and Works of Richard Lovelace* (London, 1925).

such as a ring or plate. The same is true of the word in the title "The Right Hon. My Lady Anne Lovelace," since respect is due to her marital status rather than to her own or even her husband's personal merit. In the expression "each honest Englishman" there is no implication of trustworthiness, all Englishmen of birth and substance being included. Lovelace sometimes uses the word "honour" to mean "splendor," as in "the honour of that brow" or in the "honours" of a breast. We have seen that he believed that virgins' beauty makes men strive for honor and that desire for honor causes men to do good deeds. Similarly, pride and "honour" cause a little bee to fly to Lucasta's face. Since thirst for honor leads to virtue, it is not surprising that he lists "honour" and "vertue" in the same series, just as Geoffrey of Monmouth had done seven centuries earlier. We should remember, however, that Geoffrey had included "fame" in the same series; and we should note that Lovelace later includes "glory."[47]

No new or moral meaning is called for by the word "honour" in our couplet, since Lovelace was writing in the well-established tradition of the warrior's choice between love and action, between shame and glory. The fact that he was consciously following literary tradition rather than expressing personal experience is suggested by his conventional language—he carries a shield like a knight of old, although cavalrymen of his day generally wore a casque and cuirass and often carried a carbine or a horse pistol. His reference to constancy also harks back to chivalric tradition, in which *constantia* (German *stæte*) was one of the cardinal virtues of a knight.

It is apparent that Lovelace, who was well-versed in the classics, was clearly aware of the tradition of the warrior's choice. Many artists of his and earlier times depicted the warrior torn between a beautiful woman and the call to glory; and Corneille had revived all the old motifs of this tradition in his *Cid*, which appeared only some twelve years before "To Lucasta."[48] All Lovelace wished to say was that no man of honor could be worthy or capable of true love unless he were even more con-

[47] Ed. Hazlitt: "honours," pp. 142, 159, 196; "honest ring," p. 31; "honourable plate," p. 120; "honor'd shirt," p. 183; "Right Hon.," p. 3; "honest Englishman," p. 110; "honour of that brow," p. 52; "honours of a breast," p. 196; "beauty leads to honour," p. 101; "vertue, Honour, Love and Blisse," p. 49; "With a brave pride and honour led," p. 162; "chaines that honour bind," p. 55; "vertue, honour, faith, or glory," p. 197.

[48] Rodrigue must choose between love and honor. To save his good name he must avenge his father by killing Count Gormas, the father of his sweetheart Chimène. After killing her father, Rodrigue tells Chimène he had to do it to be worthy of her ("un homme sans honneur ne te méritait pas," III, v,'40). Throughout the play the hero and heroine think almost solely of their reputations, and *honneur* is used only as a synonym of *gloire* and as antonym of *infamie*.

cerned about his good name; and that Lucasta, like other courtly lady-loves, should adore an inconstancy caused by thirst for fame and honor. In view of this, the *New English Dictionary* would do well to cite Lovelace's couplet as an illustration of objective rather than subjective honor.

Princeton University

EDWARD CHARLES WITKE

The River of Light In the *Anticlaudianus* And the *Divina Commedia*

THE QUESTION of the similarity in content of Dante's *Divina Commedia* and the *Anticlaudianus* of Alanus ab Insulis has been raised by many scholars[1] and answered to the satisfaction of at least two investigators, each opposed to the other.[2] The correspondence of the image of the river of light in the two works has also been touched upon.[3] There remains to be shown the extent of the similarity of this image in the *Anticlaudianus* and the *Paradiso,* and the differences that exist between the two. An analysis of the nature and function of the image in each work will clarify these differences. We shall not attempt to draw conclusions as to Dante's conscious use of Alanus, or indeed of any part of his Latin patrimony, though such a study would be worth while.

In Western tradition, the historical source for the equivalence of light and goodness can be traced to the sixth book of Plato's *Republic.* The analogy used by Socrates that, as the sun makes objects visible, so the idea of the Good illumines the truth,[4] had subsequent effects Plato could not have foreseen. Plotinus developed a theory of the universe and a way of life from the analogy. The intelligible "One," apex of the chain of being, was equated with perfection, the essence of truth, good, and

[1] Among them Raynaud de Lage, *Alain de Lille* (Montreal, 1951), p. 70, and E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (New York, 1953), pp. 360-362.

[2] Eugène Bossard, *Alani de Insulis Anticlaudianus* (Angers, 1885), and Karl Vossler, *Die göttliche Komödie* (Heidelberg, 1925), II, 546.

[3] Curtius, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

[4] *Republic,* VI, 508-509.

being. Being is beautiful and bestows a splendor as of light.[5] Centuries later, when texts of Plato were lost to the West, except for Chalcidius' version of the first part of *Timaeus,* Plotinus and his followers were virtually the only sources for the writings of Plato, and were very widely read. Hence their emphasis on light as goodness and as divinity passed into Western thought, no little strengthened by their Alexandrian hosts' own traditions regarding light.[6]

Augustine in Africa inherited the light tradition of the Neoplatonists and incorporated it into his own system of thought. Since human truth is the image of divine truth, knowledge is divine illumination. Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite succeeded in blending the Neoplatonic concern for light with symbology of light in the first chapter of St. John's gospel.[7] Both Augustine and the Pseudo-Dionysius were enormously influential in later mediaeval thought. Yet, even before them, the Church had been taking over symbols and images from a paganism in decline. Communications in general were kept open with the pagan community, as long as it survived, and the task of syncretism was aided by finding in non-Christian writings on religion, and more important, in philosophy, images such as the divine illumination, which corresponded to the sacred texts, themselves Hellenized to an unsuspected degree. For example, the Apocalypsis Ioannis (Revelation), 22:1 ff., reads: "Et ostendit mihi fluvium aquae vitae splendidum tamquam crystallum, procedentem de sede Dei et Agni . . . Et videbunt faciem eius [Dei] . . . Et nox ultra non erit, et non egebunt lumine lucernae, neque lumine solis, quoniam Deus illuminabit illos . . ."[8] Another example of Hellenization is "Paul" to Timothy, I Tim., 6:13 ff., which reads: "[Deus] vivificat omnia, . . . qui solus habet immortalitatem et lucem inhabitat inaccessibilem, quem nullus hominum vidit, sed nec videre potest." This is a blending of the Jewish denial of the possibility of seeing God with Hellenistic cult usage.[9] Finally, at the First Council of Nicaea, 325, the

[5] *Ennead* I, vi, pp. 77-89 (trans. MacKenna). In III, viii, 10, Plotinus uses an image of an ever-flowing spring (πηγή) which feeds rivers as an example of the life principle. It is of interest to compare this with an earlier statement, styled Pythagorean, certainly Doric, on the *tetrados* as the spring of never-failing nature, παγὰ ἀενάου φύσεως, in Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, p. 282.

[6] Edgar de Bruyne, *Etudes d'esthétique médiévale* (Bruges, 1946), III, 17 ff.

[7] See Otto von Simson, *The Gothic Cathedral* (New York, 1956), pp. 52-53.

[8] Cf. antiphon for aspersion of water in Paschal season, *Vidi aquam*, which also mentions the sustaining quality of the vision.

[9] A masterly discussion of the history of the idea of seeing God is Kenneth E. Kirk's *The Vision of God*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1932). See especially his early chapters. On pagan cult and gnostic aspiration to *illuminatio*, see Kirk, p. 102; on their rejection of discursive speculation, pp. 211 ff. Paul is bolder than the writer of Timothy: "Deus . . . illuxit in cordibus nostris ad illuminationem scientiae claritatus Dei . . ." (II Cor., 4:6).

article *lumen de lumine,* long in unofficial use, was incorporated into the Creed.

What had been an analogy in Plato became with Plotinus and other Neoplatonists something more than analogy, metaphor, or even allegory.[10] Light is divinity, the transcendental reality that both creates and sustains the universe, as well as illuminates the intellect for the knowledge of truth. Truth cannot be perceived without light, and the light in question is a reality, not a figure of speech. If this reality, this light, sustains the universe it has created, it is but a short step to postulate that light is the most direct manifestation of God, who screens Himself from man's frail intellect, which cannot gaze into pure light. By evading man, God is made manifest. This paradox is the foundation upon which much mediaeval speculation, both scientific and theological, is based.

Hrabanus Maurus (c. 780-856) maintained that a mystic meaning is hidden within scientifically knowable objects to which these objects refer. He based his views exclusively upon the authority of the sacred writings of the Church. John Scotus Erigena went even further. The formal signs of Scripture are the images of immaterial realities; so the things of the universe are a brilliance of form. There is a ray from God which imposes form on things. Brightness or clarity becomes an ontological splendor. God manifests Himself to a degree in the world by the intermediary of primordial causes, whose unification is symbolized by impenetrable light. Hence beauty is defined by Scotus as unity in diversity, and by Hugh of St. Victor and Thomas Aquinas as consonance of parts and luminosity.[11] All emanates from the "One," and brilliance of form is the principle of actuality, the essence of a thing. In short, Aquinas imposed Plotinus' chain of being on Aristotle's form and matter. Light and brightness became a principle of order and value, and that value was determined by the degree a thing partakes of light. "Chè la luce divina è penetrante / per l'universo secondo ch'è degno, / sì che nulla le puote essere ostante."[12]

Out of this long-lived tradition of light there rose by the end of the

[10] Simson, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

[11] Simson, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

[12] Dante, *Paradiso,* XXXI, 22 ff. In a passage on angelology in his *De Consideratione,* Bernard of Clairvaux has this to say of the cherubim and seraphim, those angels closest to God: "Putemus Cherubin ex ipso sapientiae fonte, ore Altissimi haurientes, et refundentes fluenta scientiae universis civibus suis. Et vide ne is sit, quem propheta [David, in Pss., 46:4] loquebatur, fluminis impetus laetificans civitatem Dei. Putemus Seraphin, spiritus totos divino igne succensos, succendere universa, ut singuli cives singulae sint lucernae ardentes et lucentes; ardentes charitate, lucentes cognitione." (*De Consideratione,* V,,4, 8, ed. Migne, *PL,* CLXXXII, 793A) We know the great esteem in which Dante held this twelfth-century philosopher, and the pinnacle he occupies in the structure of *Paradiso.*

twelfth century important concepts in two areas of human activity. Natural philosophy held that light, real physical light, is the essence of all things. Light constitutes action as well as matter; light is the creative source of all activity.[13] From this Christians inferred that, since God is perfect good, he must be perfect light also. Thus theology conceived of God as pure light, not symbolic light but actual, though metaphysical. Hence the Empyrean heaven was considered to be a realm of pure light, not embodied, but existing corporally.[14] The light on earth is akin to the pure light of heaven and serves to convey insight into the perfection of the cosmos and its Creator. But, more important, nature itself proceeds from pure light which literally illuminates the sensory world, in which similar signs pointing to immanent reality can be discerned through imagination coupled with sense experience. Natural light is a derivation, but it is not the Platonic "idea" of light, but rather substantial light. Natural light represents the lower part of the ladder and flows from the Divine, which is at the apex of the system and which is pure light. This higher level is present in the lower level though it is not clearly recognizable. This is the concept upon which so-called mediaeval realism was raised.

The later Middle Ages had always in mind the differentiation between a *res* and its *signum*. To be a *signum*, a thing had to have a structure proper to it.[15] In the Middle Ages, there was no concept of symbol as we understand it today, the sign which is valued in and for itself. The word for the Middle Ages was not the symbol, but rather the sym-

[13] E. de Bruyne, *op. cit.*, III, 3 ff.

[14] Cf. Bonaventure, *Sent.*, I, i: "Lux potest tripliciter considerari, scilicet in se, et in transparenti, et in extremitate perspicui terminati. Primo modo est lux, secundo modo lumen, tertio modo hypostasis coloris." The distinction between *lux* and *colorfulgor* allowed Bonaventure and Robert Grosseteste to reconcile the Neoplatonic concept of light as a substance with the Aristotelian doctrine of light as an accidental quality. Cf. de Bruyne, *op. cit.*, III, 16-29. John of Salisbury provides a remarkable instance of how far twelfth-century thought was prepared to go in equating God with light. In *Metalogicon*, IV, 37 (ed. Webb), taking his departure from I Tim., 6:16 quoted above, John writes: "Principium, inquit [David, Pss., 119:160] verborum tuorum veritas; eo quod a luce inaccessibili, quam Deus inhabitat, habet ut ei omnia innotescant. Hanc tamen lucem a substantia eius non arbitror alienam." John elaborates this in IV, 39: "Veritas autem lux mentis est et materia rationis. Hanc Deus universaliter, angelus particulariter intuetur; homo autem, etiam perfectissimus, pro parte modice videt; sed quo perfectior, eo amplius appetit. Hec est soliditatis certitudinis, in qua rationis viget examen. Tolle lucem et soliditatem, frustrabuntur visus et tactus..." This enunciation of the scale of merit, and indeed this whole passage, should be compared to *Paradiso*, XXXI, 22 ff., quoted above. Cf. also Giovanni Busnelli, *Il concetto e l'ordine del Paradiso dantesco*, Part I (Città di Castello, 1911), pp. 87 ff., 209 ff.

[15] This is perhaps most easily seen in architectural allegory; before being an allegory, a church had to be first an edifice.

bol was what the word referred to.[16] The whole of creation, including literature both sacred and profane, was a book, a revelation.[17] True mediaeval allegory or symbolism is not a literary invention but claims foundation on observation of objective realities.[18]

If there is a lack of preciseness in mediaeval definitions of allegory and symbol it is because there were two sources for these concepts: one was classical, found in the many grammars and studies of rhetoric, as well as philosophical treatises; the other was theological. In their turn, these two sources were treated by imagination and by reason, and from the dynamic interplay between these two faculties the thought of the period took shape.

Little is to be gained by forcing a distinction between allegory and symbol[19] in the Middle Ages; for the distinction, if it exists at all, was not present in mediaeval thought, except perhaps for John Scotus, who might have felt that symbol is more natural, allegory more contrived—a distinction useless for our inquiry. But within the symbolic mode of expression we can distinguish at least two types of symbol and consequently two specific uses of the method.

The first type functions to make something clearer or more vivid by a close analogy or comparison. In this mode of expression, the signum can be understood through sense experience, while the res cannot. The nature of the signum corresponds closely to the nature of the res, though it is not identical with the res. By understanding the signum through experience common to all men, a clearer perception is gained of the res, which cannot be directly experienced. Because of close similarities in the nature of two beings of different genres or species, an analogy is possible. Like all analogies, this type of signum interprets its res as well as represents it. The mode of this symbolism is referential, and there is a correspondence between the referring word and what the word refers to.

The second type of symbol also functions to elucidate a res which cannot be understood through sense experience. Its signum also can be understood, more or less as it stands, by experience common to all men, or at least is readily conceivable. But, in this second type of symbol, the res transcends its signum, which is of a lower order and totally separate from the order of its res, and hence stands in only a superficially analo-

[16] Helen E. Dunbar, *Symbolism in Medieval Thought* (New Haven, 1929), Appendix IV, p. 500.

[17] Cf. Charles S. Singleton, *An Essay on the Vita Nuova* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), pp. 38 ff.

[18] See de Bruyne, *op. cit.*, II, 302 ff.

[19] Provided we do not restrict allegory to personification; cf. Dunbar, *op. cit.*, pp. 278 ff.

gous relationship to it. The one order stands above the other, but is perceptible only in terms of the lesser order, or signum—the only possible link by which the transcendent[20] res may be grasped. An analogy is not possible, as it was with the first type of symbol, because beings of two different orders, with few similarities of nature, if any, cannot, according to mediaeval speculation, stand in analogous relationship. The signum gains importance as it is realized to be the sole means to knowledge of its transcendent res, but it is never identified with the res completely. Comprehension of the signum does not lead to comprehension of the res, as in the first type of symbol. At best, it leads to an intuitive awareness of the res.

Mediaeval dualism fixed a gulf between mind and matter, soul and body, reality and appearance. The intellectual is constantly contrasted with the sensory, which is held to be less real. The *symbol* is reality itself, not the *word* which functions as a sign pointing to that reality. Symbol in this second sense transcends the sensory. As the world of appearance is a revelation of ultimate reality, so the word may be an intuitive preception of the idea which is immanent in the word, as God is immanent in the world. Words which are incidentally referential must be used to communicate significance which is beyond perception. The significance of the higher order can only be set forth in terms of the lower referential order. But there is no correspondence between referring word and thing referred to; this symbolic mode is intuitive.

Bearing these distinctions in mind, let us turn to a consideration of the image of the river of light in Alanus and in Dante.

Alanus ab Insulis (1128-1203) "would not invite the accusation of having left anything unsaid."[21] This "thorough digester of available knowledge" was not a "great thinker,"[22] yet it has been maintained that Alanus founded a new poetic genre, the "philosophical-theological epic."[23] If this is true, we should not be too harsh with his long-winded metaphysical poems.[24] He was immensely popular in his day—103 manuscripts of the *Anticlaudianus* alone are extant, four of them dating from the twelfth century.[25] Both literally and figuratively Alanus operated on a timeless plane; the *Anticlaudianus* is more than 4,300 hex-

[20] The Platonic concept of the transcendence of the ideal and the Aristotelian doctrine of the immanence of the ideal were by this time finally reconciled. As early as Boethius, the difficulty of maintaining the division of immanence and transcendence had been recognized. See E. K. Rand, *Founders of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), p. 142.

[21] W. H. Cornog, *The Anticlaudian of Alain de Lille* (Philadelphia, 1935), p. 44.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[23] Curtius, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[24] See R. de Lage, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 35, note 74.

ameter verses long, "probably the most complete single summation we have of twelfth century conventional philosophy."[26]

The poem concerns the creation of a new man. Nature has grown weary of her supreme creation, man, and desires to replace him with a better model. She is aided in her task of creating the body of the new man, Juvenis, by the Virtues, both theological and courtly. But for the soul Phronesis (Wisdom) advises that Nature must appeal to God, and volunteers to undertake the journey herself. A special chariot is speedily built by the Seven Liberal Arts and harnessed with the Five Senses. The chariot then bears Phronesis, Reason, Prudence, and Faith to heaven. In the realm of Theology, all but Phronesis and Faith are forced to leave the chariot. These two personifications finally attain the Empyrean heaven, whose wonders they behold in a mirror. Among these wonders is a fountain, which gives rise to a brook, which in turn becomes a river. The streams and their source are at once of water and of light, of brightness surpassing the earthly sun, of perfume surpassing all mundane scents. God grants Phronesis' appeal for a new soul for the new man, and the soul is returned to Nature's domain, where Juvenis is finally created whole. He does battle with the Vices, wins, and establishes the possibility of a new age for mankind.

The image of the streams of light will bear a closer analysis. It is very difficult to determine what is structural to this long poem and what is not. Certainly the action is not advanced by the nearly forty-line description of one particular wonder in heaven; neither is this description in any way integral to the plot. The sole excuse for its inclusion is that it serves a didactic function rather than a purely decorative one.

But what does the river of light teach? We read that it conquers the stars by its brightness: "sidera luce domat..." (VI, 236).[27] Fount, brook, and stream are alike in honor and perfume. The river

> ...totum sibi fontis honorem
> Assumit fontique pari respondet honore...
> Ergo fons rivum, rivus cum fonte fluentum
> Producit, retinens fontis rivique saporem.

Although they are diverse they are of one substance, three in one:

> Cum sint diversi[28] ...in unum
> Conveniunt eademque trium substancia, simplex
> Esse, sapor similis, color unus, splendor in illis
> Unicus.
> Hic radium fundit quem sol mundanus adorat,

[26] Cornog, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

[27] All citations from *Anticlaudianus* are from *Alain de Lille: Anticlaudianus: texte critique*, ed. R. Bossuat (Paris, 1955). The image of the river of light begins at VI, 234 in this and in Migne, *PL*, CCX, 544C.

[28] Or, with Migne, *distincti*. Differences in orthography are not noted.

and its ray is never eclipsed. It is like the earthly sun,

> ... sol unus et unum
> Cum gignente manens, lux luci consona, fulgor
> Fulgori splendorque sui non immemor ignis,

and it too produces heat and flame or brightness:

> De se producit radius cum sole calorem
> Qui mulcens urit ...
> Sic calor expugnat ignem, sic flamma repellit[29]
> Flammam, sic estus estum splendorque caminum,

which redounds to the benefit of man:

> Pullulat in flores mens isto tacta calore,
> Et terram mentis virtutum flore beato
> Purpurat iste calor, dum ver celeste reducit.

Obviously the parable of the spring, the brook, and the river refers to the Trinity. Note how the Church phrases its thought:

> Non in unius singularitate personae sed in unius Trinitate substantiae. Quod enim de tua gloria, revelante te, credimus, hoc de Filio tuo, hoc de Spiritu sancto, sine differentia discretionis sentimus ... in personis proprietas, et in essentia unitas, et in majestate ... aequalitas.[30]

The whole image in Alanus is analogous to the doctrine of the Trinity. One in substance and honor, distinct in person. It was nothing new to liken the Trinity to the three aspects of a single sunbeam, full of light, heat, and potential to growth. Limitless allegorizations of these aspects are possible. Let one in Alanus' image suffice. *Calor* seems to refer to the Holy Spirit's activities.[31] Granted that for Alanus the Trinity was an ineffable mystery, still he felt he could make the nature of the doctrine clearer to his readers by comparing it to the three aspects of light and the three streams of water. Anyone can understand the picture which Alanus draws, the fountain giving rise to a brook, which becomes a river, all flowing with the same water. By making them into streams of light, he departs a step away from sense experience, or experience readily imaginable, but still it is not difficult to conceive of his image. His readers would naturally think of the river of life, especially if they were scholars, and Alanus intended his works for scholars.[32] There is no mystical or profound insight into the Trinity, but still one conceives of it somewhat more clearly by comparing it to natural phenomena or

[29] Migne, *repelli.*
[30] Trinity preface.
[31] Cf. Whitsunday sequence: "... in aestu temperies ... Flecte quod est rigidum, fove quod est frigidum."
[32] R. de Lage, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

imaginary phenomena treated as if they were actual. What was already known and speculated concerning the res can be set forth strikingly by the signum of analogy.

The symbol or image used by Alanus clearly belongs to the first order of symbol distinguished above. The Trinity itself cannot be understood by sense experience. Strictly speaking, neither can the doctrine of the Trinity. Yet the concepts of the doctrine can be the subject of an analogy, because an appropriate analogy, such as that used by Alanus, embodies striking similarities to known and excogitated formulations of the doctrine. Alanus does not try to present a new experience of his own in connection with the Trinity.

Let us now turn our attention to Dante's image of the river of light in *Paradiso,* XXX. When Beatrice has led him from the Primum Mobile to the Empyrean heaven, Dante is accorded a series of illuminations, of which that of the river of light is but one. The whole of the *Paradiso,* if not the whole *Commedia,* has led up to these succeeding visions.[33] First a flash of light surrounds Dante

> e lasciommi fasciato di tal velo
> del suo fulgor, che nulla m'appariva.[34]
> (Lines 50-51)

This is indeed the love that blinds. Beatrice as Dante's means to revelation, rather than revelation itself, replies that love receives (souls) unto itself "per far disposto a sua fiamma il candelo" (line 54).[35] Man's corporal nature renders his reason discursive.[36] If he wants to see the truth face to face, he must mount above his own strength. Clearly we are passing from the order of intellect and reason into that of intuition and faith. The divine order so transcends the world's order that new vision is needed and with it a new mode of expression, a symbology which will go beyond the sensory to embody truth in itself.[37] Analogy cannot be used because of the transcendental quality of the experience.

Dante writes, "e di novella vista me raccesi" (line 58). What can this new vision be? Man by his own efforts cannot attain the vision Dante will be afforded, simply because he is man, even though in a state

[33] Especially if Dante thought himself a new St. Paul (J. B. Fletcher, *Symbolism of the Divine Comedy,* New York, 1921, p. 102) and the *Commedia* a "Summa salvationis" (H. O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind,* Cambridge, Mass., 1949, II, 568).

[34] All citations from *Divina Commedia* are from the edition of the Società Dantesca Italiana, 1946.

[35] Cf. Plotinus, I, vi, 9: Οὐ γὰρ ἄν πώποτε εἶδεν ὀφθαλμὸς ἥλιον ἡλιοειδὴς μὴ γεγενημένος. (For never did eye see the sun unless first made sunlike.)

[36] Fletcher, *op. cit.,* pp. 206-207.

[37] Cf. Taylor, *op. cit.,* II, 582, on the mediaeval notion of symbols themselves embodying truth.

of perfection. Rapture is a rape of the soul from the body, as etymological comparison shows. By a special grace Dante is allowed to have his soul sundered from his body, so that with the eyes of his soul he may witness the courts of heaven.[38]

E vidi lume in forma di rivera
fluvido di fulgore intra due rive
dipinte di mirabil primavera.
Di tal fiumana uscìan faville vive,
e d'ogni parte si mettien ne' fiori,
quasi rubin che oro circunscrive.
Poi, come inebriate dalli odori
riprofondavan sè nel miro gurge;
e s'una intrava, un altra n'uscìa fori.[39]
(Lines 61-69)

As soon as his new vision was kindled, he saw light in the form of a river. The contemporaneousness of the acts of rekindling vision and seeing the river must be stressed. The new vision which transcends the natural demands a new means of communication. The new vision can be expressed only in terms of the second type of symbol distinguished above, the intuitive symbol. But even this new vision is not enough, for Dante still sees the *lumen gloriae* behind its mask, as a river of light. Now the river of light, even though it is within the order of the divine, is not that order seen face to face, but enigmatically. The enigma of the river of light is not analogous at all to "ambo le corti del ciel." Yet, at this stage of his enlightenment, it is the only sign Dante has of the real heaven. He is aware of *what* the sign stands for, and desires fervently to actualize his potential knowledge. The river disappears into the reality of glory once its function has served its purpose, namely, to instill awareness of and desire for perfect comprehension. Dante's thirst for more knowledge concerning what is embodied in that symbol leads Beatrice to say,

ma di quest'acqua convien che tu bei
prima che tanta sete in te si sazii.
(Lines 73-74)

[38] Cf. *Paradiso*, I, 73-75; II, 37-39; XXXIII, 139. Is it not logical to assume that the actual sundering took place at XXX, 60, even though Dante had been sleeping up to then? XXXIII, 139 definitely shows the separation, and the two preceding references show uncertainty as to the condition.

[39] In his article, "Dante, the Poet of Love," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, XCIX, No. 3 (June 1955), pp. 133-145, J. A. Mazzeo terms this passage "one of the most original inspiration" (p. 135), and calls the language Dante uses to try to communicate the vision "childlike . . . repetition," the "simplest of rhetorical devices" (p. 137, on *Par.*, XXX, 95 ff.). In this article, Mazzeo also touches upon Dante's light terms, asking whether they are "mere metaphors" or are "literally" used (p. 137).

Only by an inpouring of grace into his soul will Dante be able to see the vision in its whole reality, and ultimately become one with pure being. Meanwhile through symbols Dante penetrates beyond the sensory and proceeds to visions of greater and greater reality. "Così mi disse il sol delli occhi miei" (line 75).

Following the division systematized by Bonaventure,[40] we see that the reference to Beatrice as "sol delli occhi miei" throws into relief the levels of meaning here. Metaphorically and allegorically, or what is to be believed concerning divinity and humanity, Beatrice is the means whereby knowledge is to be gained from the revelation.[41] Morally or ethically, we learn that prayer precedes illumination. Anagogically, toward a union with God who is the end of allegory or faith as well as of morals, we see that infusion of grace must precede the beatific vision. The higher creator stoops to the lower creature, no matter how perfect that lower creature may be. Until divinity descends man will only see types and shadows of the real divinity, will see rivers of light and not heaven. Beatrice calls attention to the true nature of the splendid river—streams, topazes, and smiling grass: "son di lor vero umbriferi prefazii" (line 78). The obscurity was willed by God when he created man's nature:

> Non che da sè sian queste cose acerbe;
> ma è difetto dalla parte tua,
> che non hai viste ancor tanto superbe.
> (Lines 79-81)

And Dante bathes his eyes in the stream, assimilates himself into the symbol:

> ... per far migliori spegli
> ancor delli occhi.
> (Lines 85-86)
>
> ... io vidi
> ambo le corti del ciel manifeste.
> O isplendor di Dio, per cu' io vidi
> l'alto triunfo del regno verace,
> dammi virtù a dir com' io il vidi!
> (Lines 95-99)

Three times is *io vidi* repeated, to convey the wonder that he saw the courts of heaven. But, though Dante was granted this vision, his reader is not. Dante can only canalize and guide the reader's experience by

[40] But the division is much older, dating from Ambrose and Cassian. Rand, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[41] Cf. Fletcher, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-155.

symbols which transcend natural phenomena. The mystical vision is not translatable in terms of analogy.

The river of light, the sea of light, the theater of the divine drama, the mystic rose, succeed each other as illuminations. The river of light has all along been the mystic rose, the courts of heaven, but human weakness prevented piercing beyond the veil of the river. Just so human frailty, the necessity of using words which are totally inadequate to communicate the majesty of the heavens, necessitates the succeeding symbols of the rose and the rest.

> Oh quanto è corto il dire e come fioco
> al mio concetto!
>
> (XXXIII, 121-122)

In the image of "lume in forma di rivera," what the words refer to transcends the words and at the same time can only be set forth in words. A river of light from which sparks leap is not analogous to the courts of heaven with the angels and souls of the just. Certainly the comparison is less close than Alanus ab Insulis' comparison of the doctrine of the Trinity to a threefold stream of water and ray of light. At least in Alanus' image there is a resemblance between the doctrine's teaching and its symbol. But Dante is not trying to make comparison or to explicate. On the contrary, he is trying *not* to be discursive but rather visionary. But he can communicate his vision only by means of symbols.[42] The nature of the symbol chosen does not depend upon its possessing the same characteristics as what is being symbolized. The res and signum are here further apart than in Alanus' image, because Dante is not describing the formulated but trying to make perceptible to himself as well as to his reader the previously unknown, ultimate reality. To be sure, the splendor and light of the river is a fitting image for the final manifestation of heaven, but it does not bear the close resemblance of symbol and thing symbolized as in Alanus' work.

Yet, in another sense the signum and res here are completely inseparable. For the reader, Dante's vision can be conceived only in terms of the signa Dante chose. For Dante, the res could have been set forth by other signa, and hence the signa chosen may not be the unique (for the signum is not identical with the res) but only the most suitable for his purpose. When one sphere or order of being stands above another lesser order, and when that higher order cannot be expressed except through a lower order, we cannot determine whether the particular

[42] It is useless for our inquiry to speculate whether Dante was convinced that he had experienced his mystical vision or only had the gift of setting forth such a spiritual experience. Cf. Fletcher, *op. cit.*, pp. 242-243, and Taylor, *op. cit.*, II, 589. What is important is that Dante did communicate such a vision.

lower order used is better than another. What we can with assurance maintain is that the higher order of Dante's vision, as it is embodied in the series of illuminations beginning with *Paradiso,* XXX, is a new insight. It tells the reader something new, for it is a new res, a res perceived by Dante alone, and by none before.

Alanus' image served a didactic function in that it described and made more vivid the formulations of divinity. Dante's image, if didactic, is less diffuse in its attempt, and more personal. It aims at presenting one particular illumination previously nonexistent. This vision transcends the previously known, and cannot fall back on analogy, because neither its transcendent nature nor its uniqueness will allow it. Description failing, Dante turned his mind upon itself and conceived the symbols he used in the *Commedia* as those in terms of which he had had his vision—a glimpse past matter into pure being.

The *Divina Commedia* and the *Anticlaudianus* both try to communicate a state of man. Spiritual life can be attained only through the help of God, through grace. One ascends to spirituality from the lower levels of nature and reason to the higher levels of intuition and faith. At this stage one beholds the wonders of the heavens in the form of light which radiates from God. But here the similarity of the two works ends. The image of light symbolizing the Trinity and the image symbolizing the courts of heaven differ, and the ground of their difference lies not only in structural and textual divergences but in the fact that they are different types of symbols.

Cambridge, Mass.

THOMAS R. WHITAKER

The Drinkers And History: Rabelais, Balzac, and Joyce

BECAUSE *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* so frequently suggest Rabelais in style and in mode of comedy, we look for more than general resemblances or affinities.[1] But has Joyce anywhere incorporated Rabelaisian scenes and motifs in the analogical manner of his composite epics? There seems at least one such place. Foster Damon, discussing the permutations of style in *Ulysses,* has remarked that the "party at the hospital works up to Rabelais' *Discourse of the Drinkers.*"[2] But this is more than a stylistic echo. Almost everywhere in Joyce's work the apparently trivial carries important themes; here the disconnected talk of Rabelais' drinkers has been reshaped and expanded to render the principles of flux and reflux in Joyce's epic sea.

It is appropriate that the episode in the lying-in hospital, a comic paean to fertility and diversity, should recall the chapter in which, just before Gargamelle brings Gargantua into the world, Rabelais presents without comment or transition the representative talk of his time. His clerics, lawyers, soldiers, etc. are identified solely by their distinctive language. During the labor of Mrs. Purefoy, Joyce explicitly notes his drinkers' various occupations, but the shifting language implies an even broader panorama. The voice of Malory informs us that the drinkers include "scholars of medicine," franklins, one with the "mien of a frere,"

[1] Almost every critic of Joyce has noted some general resemblances. A convenient summary is provided by Duncan Mallam, "Joyce and Rabelais," *Univ. of Kansas City Review,* XXIII (1956), 99-110.

[2] "The Odyssey in Dublin," in Seon Givens, ed., *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism* (New York, 1948), p. 217.

and the "meek sir Leopold"; and the voice of Macaulay proclaims: "The high hall of Horne's house had never beheld an assembly so representative and so varied nor had the old rafters of that establishment ever listened to a language so encyclopaedic."[3] As the narrator and his world move through history, the once-upon-a-time of *Gargantua* becomes the every day of *Ulysses*.

There is also a Joycean "correspondence" between this part of *Gargantua* and the universal Odyssey in Dublin. In the hospital episode the voyagers slaughter and eat the Oxen of the Sun, symbols of fertility. The birth of Gargantua was both precipitated and hindered by a similar indulgence. Grangousier, having killed "three hundred sixty seven thousand and fourteen" beeves, had invited all in the surrounding countryside to feast on the "abundance of tripes." Rabelais' drinkers cried, "hey day, here are tripes fit for our sport, and in earnest excellent Godebillios of the dun Oxe (you know) with the black streak. O for God's sake let us lash them soundly, yet thriftily." But, through overeating, Gargamelle herself met the accident that Molly Bloom specifically recalls (p. 736), filtered through Urquhart's translation and her own obsession with the female flux of life, in Joyce's final recapitulation of themes: "Her bum-gut . . . escaped her," and labor ensued with all its complications.[4] The protean development of this motif in the hospital episode of *Ulysses* centers upon Mr. Deasy's letter concerning the hoof-and-mouth disease, and modulates through Lenehan's Rabelaisian habits (upon downing "a platter of tripes" he could always "bring himself off" with "some randy quip") and a French discussion of the Kerry cows to be butchered ("*Mort aux vaches,* says Frank then in the French language that had been indentured to a brandy shipper that has a wine-lodge in Bordeaux and he spoke French like a gentleman too") to a Swiftian allegory concerning Irish, English, and Roman bulls (pp. 391 ff.).

Given such a basis, Joyce can include a variety of Rabelaisian echoes, some central to his running metaphors, others mere verbal twists that keep the comic parallel before the reader. If events in Dublin are less than Gargantuan, as they are less than Homeric, he often introduces a compensating inflation. Though Gargamelle's child is two months overdue (I, 31), Mrs. Purefoy is only "two days past her term" (p. 391), but "she hath waited marvellous long" (p. 381), and the nurse testifies

[3] *Ulysses* (New York, 1946), pp. 382, 410. All references are to this Modern Library edition.

[4] *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, tr. Sir Thomas Urquhart and Peter Le Motteux, introduction by Charles Whibley (London, 1900), I, 33, 34, 37, 33. All references are to this translation, which Leopold Bloom brought home for Molly.

"that she had seen many births of women but never was none so hard as was that woman's birth" (p. 380).

Rabelais describes at length the difficulties of the midwives, one of whom finally "made her so horrible a restrictive and binding medicine, and whereby all her *larris,* arse-pipes and conduits were so opilated, stopped, obstructed, and contracted, that you could hardily have opened and enlarged them with your teeth, which is a terrible thing to think upon" (I, 40); Joyce counters with the comically terse voice of Pepys: "the midwives sore put to it and can't deliver, she queasy for a bowl of riceslop that is a shrewd drier up of the insides" (p. 391).

Grangousier's potency is celebrated in his conversation with his wife and the nurse (I, 39); Purefoy's is praised by the Dublin drinkers, "each after his own fashion" (p. 401), and by Joyce in Carlylese apostrophe (p. 416). The birth of Gargantua through his mother's ear leads to Rabelais' discussion of the abnormal deliveries found in mythology and in Pliny's *Natural History* (I, 41); when the Purefoy birth is announced, the Dublin students discuss the more variously abnormal nativities found in the annals of modern medicine and in Aristotle's *Masterpiece* (pp. 403-404; cf. p. 232). Gargantua is furnished milk by "seventeen thousand, nine hundred, and thirteen Cowes" or, according to some doctors, by Gargamelle herself, who "could draw out of her breasts one thousand, four hundred, two pipes, and nine pailes of milke at every time" (I, 42); Joyce's apostrophe to Purefoy rises to this climax:

> How saith Zarathusthra? *Deine Kuh Truebsal melkest Du. Nun trinkst Du die suesse Milch des Euters.* See! It displodes for thee in abundance. Drink, man, an udderful! Mother's milk, Purefoy, the milk of human kin, milk too of those burgeoning stars overhead, rutilant in thin rainvapor, punch milk, such as those rioters will quaff in their guzzlingden, milk of madness, the honeymilk of Canaan's land [pp. 416-417].

Here comic inflation becomes cosmic and merges with other symbols for the feminine aspect of Joyce's universal sea. Bloom, for example, has thought during this episode of the "queen among the Pleiades" (p. 407); Stephen's association, throughout the day, of midwives, Eve, and Traherne's paradisal wheat (pp. 38-39, 196, 238) will lead to his vision of Mrs. Purefoy on the altarstone of the Black Mass (p. 583); and Molly, recumbent Gaea-Tellus, will meditate upon Gargamelle. Earlier in the hospital episode, Rabelaisian fragments seem to expand until they reflect the masculine aspect of that sea. A song in praise of drink

> Ainsi se feist Jacques Cueur riche
> Ainsi profitent boys en friche,

Ainsi conquesta Bacchus l'Inde,
Ainsi philosophie Melinde[5]

is followed by a proverb, "long tipling breaks the thunder" (I, 37). Stephen's comparably boastful song concerns not Charles VII's Master of the Mint but the cosmic house-that-Jack-built, the "crystal palace of the Creator":

Behold the mansion reared by dedal Jack,
See the malt stored in many a refluent sack,
In the proud cirque of Jackjohn's bivouac.

And it is followed by the actual thunder of "old Nobodaddy . . . in his cups," which, providing the last line of the quatrain, breaks the blasphemous tippler himself: "A black crack of noise in the street here, alack, bawled, back. Loud on left Thor thundered: in anger awful the hammerhurler" (p. 388).

When the drinkers' conversation draws to a close, the Rabelaisian apostrophe to a wine, "*O lachryma Christi*" (I, 38), may become drunken mock sympathy with the Christ-figure Bloom ("Thou'll no be telling me thot, Pold veg! Did ums blubble bigsplash crytears cos frien Padney was took off in black bag?"); and the punning antistrophe, "je y suis maistre passé. A brum! A brum! je suis prebstre Macé,"[6] may become a confidently distorted phrase from Burns' "O Willie brew'd a peck o' maut" followed by a garbled test for intoxication: "We're nae the fou. The Leith police dismisseth us. The least tholice."

But more certain and more serious is the final echo. Rabelais (in Urquhart's version) concludes the chapter of drunken fragments with a coherent and vigorous invitation to partake of the divine medicine: "come, therefore blades to this divine liquor, and celestial juyce, swill it over heartily, and spare not, it is a decoction of Nectar and Ambrosia" (I, 38).[7] Joyce concludes with a parodied gospel call, selling in the name of "him that walked the waves" (cf. p. 51) a drink of salvation to those already drowned in drink. It sardonically implies the full creative and destructive force behind this stormy world of cycles, both the ominous shout or noise in the street that is God for thunder-fearing Stephen (pp. 35, 184, 388, 494, 559) and the paradisal "punch milk" of the "burgeoning stars" or rainy Pleiades:

[5] *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Jacques Boulenger (Paris, 1951), p. 41. This is one of the few places where the original is perhaps closer to *Ulysses* than is Urquhart's version ("Thus became Tom Tossepot rich . . .").

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 43. Cf. Urquhart: "I am prester mast, (Prish)-Brum I should say master past" (I, 38).

[7] The conclusion in the original stresses even more firmly the counterpart of Joyce's coughmixture: "Avallez, ce sont herbes!" *Œuvres complètes*, p. 43.

Come on, you winefizzling ginsizzling booseguzzling existences! . . . Shout salvation in king Jesus. You'll need to rise precious early, you sinner there, if you want to diddle the Almighty God . . . He's got a coughmixture with a punch in it for you, my friend, in his backpocket. Just you try it on [pp. 420-421].

Another group of symbolic echoes helps to keep in a single focus both Stephen's frustrated ambitions and the Logos that has created and ordered this epic sea. Though young Purefoy does not enter the world through his mother's ear, the embryonic development of the English language during this episode stresses the "ineluctable modality of the audible" and culminates, as placentation ends, in Stephen's "utterance of the Word" (p. 415). If this association of Word and birth derives partly from the magical tradition,[8] its present grotesque form has still further Rabelaisian basis. "I have the word of the Gospel in my mouth, Sitio," said a drinker (I, 37). Stephen, who echoed that "last word" of the Incarnate Word earlier in the day—"I thirst" (p. 51)—now shouts its equivalent, the name of a public house: "Burke's! Outflings my lord Stephen, giving the cry . . ." And Gargantua himself, as soon as he was born, "cried not as other babes use to do, *miez, miez, miez, miez,* but with a high, sturdy, and big voice shouted aloud, Some drink, some drink, some drink, as inviting all the world to drink with him" (I, 40). In *Ulysses* all adjourn to Burke's in response to Stephen's invitation.

This comic deflating of the pseudotheological Son and self-styled priest of the word to a new-born Gargantuan infant is appropriate in many ways. The young hydrophobe, so recently bathed by his mother, now begins most obviously to need rescue from the sea by his unrecognized spiritual father and complement. In the symbolic juxtapositions that close the episode (pp. 420-421), Bloom appears diabolic ("who the sooty hell's the johnny in the black duds? . . . Sinned against the light") but is secretly the expected Savior: "Elijah is coming" (cf. pp. 149, 339). It is he, not the Deity of Alexander Dowie, who later provides the only divine medicine that Stephen receives. And his kind and resourceful ministrations, which have, to be sure, no earth-shaking effect, are epitomized not by a coughmixture with a punch but by a more gently "jocoserious" and more humanistic "collation for a gentile": "Epp's massproduct, the creature cocoa" (pp. 660, 661).

Stephen had already described to the drinkers the alchemy whereby the artist brings the Word to birth, as he expounded, in the manner of

[8] See Stuart Gilbert, *James Joyce's "Ulysses," A Study* (New York, 1931), p. 289. But, as the introductory epic simile makes clear, the utterance is more pertinently Stephen's imitation of the divine thunder's creative Word and his playing the role of Nobodaddy in his cups. Never fully aware of the fact, Stephen ("Kinch") is always the hangman god in little.

a Jacobean divine, a text from Blake with the help of symbols from Yeats:

> Know all men, he said, time's ruins build eternity's mansions. What means this? Desire's wind blasts the thorntree but after it becomes from a bramblebush to be a rose upon the rood of time. Mark me now. In woman's womb word is made flesh but in the spirit of the maker all flesh that passes becomes the word that shall not pass away. This is the postcreation [p. 385].[9]

As always, Stephen presents a romantically limited version of Joyce's aesthetic and is unable to use it as a basis for his own art. Hence the embryonic development of the flesh and of all history in this episode results for him merely in the utterance of "Burke's!" The comic postcreation—the dissection following this murder, suffocation, or seadeath, if we may suspect a punning Word—is Joyce's. For the Shakespearean God at the summit of Stephen's Hamlet analogy, "all in all in all of us" (p. 210), is the artist who stands outside the cyclical world of *Ulysses* paring his nails and yet is immanent in that world, fingernails and all.

Because the postcreation was made possible by Joyce's comic self-transcendence, it is appropriate that a passage in *Finnegans Wake* should drench with irony even this epic success. The same passage casts an oblique light on the hospital episode, and perhaps on the relation of Joyce to Rabelais. Shem the penman follows the alchemical doctrine that the most common, personal, and corruptible substance must be transmuted into the incorruptible Word. Writing with ink made from his own excrement, he transmutes his life into "a no uncertain quantity of obscene matter not protected by copriright in the United Stars of Ourania"—into the word that images all history: "the first till last alshemist wrote over every square inch of the only foolscap available, his own body, till by its corrosive sublimation one continuous present tense integument slowly unfolded all marryvoising moodmoulded cyclewheeling history . . ." But Shem does not experience the deification to which Stephen aspired: "with each word that would not pass away the squidself which he had squirtscreened from the crystalline world waned chagreenold and doriangrayer in its dudhud."[10]

Glancing here at Stephen's sermon (and at Wilde's novel), Joyce endorses Balzac's theory of the exhaustion of self in creativity, which had been symbolized by the shrinking of the magic chagreen with every wish

[9] See Blake's letter to Hayley, May 6, 1800, in *The Complete Writings of William Blake*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes (London, 1957), p. 797, and such poems by Yeats as "Red Hanrahan's Song About Ireland" and "To the Rose upon the Rood of Time."

[10] *Finnegans Wake* (New York, 1939), pp. 185-186.

granted its possessor, Raphaël de Valentin. In fact, Joyce may have drawn upon Balzac years before, when composing the hospital episode. *Louis Lambert* contains a most succinct version of Stephen's doctrine of the postcreation: "peut-être un jour le sens inverse de l'Et VERBUM CARO FACTUM EST sera-t-il le résumé d'un nouvel Évangile qui dira: ET LA CHAIR SE FERA LE VERBE, ELLE DEVIENDRA LA PAROLE DE DIEU."[11] And *La Peau de chagrin* may have suggested expanding the conversation of Rabelais' drinkers into a vision of the flux and reflux of history—for that is what happens when Raphaël attends a banquet celebrating the inauguration of a newspaper.

There, as in *Ulysses,* the drinkers become a representative group of "les jeunes gens les plus remarquables" of the metropolis (XV, 38-39). As Joyce said of his own wordfest, "The debate which ensued was in its scope and progress an epitome of the course of life" (p. 410), so Balzac had proclaimed of his:

> C'était tout à la fois un livre et un tableau. Les philosophies, les religions, les morales, . . . les gouvernements, enfin tous les grands actes de l'intelligence humaine tombèrent sous une faux aussi longue que celle du Temps, et peut-être eussiez-vous pu difficilement décider si elle était maniée par la Sagesse ivre, ou par l'Ivresse devenue sage et clairvoyante. Emportés par une espèce de tempête, ces esprits semblaient, comme la mer irritée contre ses falaises, vouloir ébranler toutes les lois entre lesquelles flottent les civilisations, satisfaisant ainsi sans le savoir à la volonté de Dieu, qui laisse dans la nature le bien et le mal en gardant pour lui seul le secret de leur lutte perpétuelle. Furieuse et burlesque, la discussion fut en quelque sorte un sabbat des intelligences. Entre les tristes plaisanteries dites par ces enfants de la Révolution à la naissance d'un journal, et les propos tenus par de joyeux buveurs à la naissance de Gargantua, se trouvait tout l'abîme qui sépare le XIXe siècle du XVIe. Celui-ci apprêtait une destruction en riant, le nôtre riait au milieu des ruines [XV, 42].

Almost every phrase might apply to the intellectual Witches' Sabbath on Holles Street, where the discourse enacts the ebb and flow of civilization and also presents the chaos of a time separated from the sixteenth century by a yet greater abyss. For, despite the embryonic development of style, "Burke's!" is followed by a linguistic "displosion" as violent as that of the "punch milk," and Joyce's drinkers laugh yet more sadly and frenetically amid the ruins. This Dublin where heroic action bogs down in reflection and utterance is also foreshadowed by one of Balzac's drinkers, a savant who sketches in Vichian terms the decline and fragmentation of society. The present barbarism of the intellect seems the last stage before complete dissolution. "Aussi ne nous appuyons-nous ni sur la religion, ni sur la force matérielle, mais sur

[11] Balzac, *Œuvres complètes* (Paris, 1879), XVII, 99. All references are to this edition.

l'intelligence. Le livre vaut-il le glaive? la discussion vaut-elle l'action? Voilà le problème" (XV, 47).

Introduced by a discussion of the problematic nature of divine retribution that dimly suggests an aspect of Stephen's and Haines' views of each other (see pp. 245, 405), the concluding note in Balzac's scene is as ambiguously theological as that in Joyce. "Hélas! . . . je ne vois pas où poser les pieds entre la géométrie de l'incrédule et le *Pater noster* du pape. Bah! buvons! *Trinc* est, je crois, l'oracle de la dive bouteille et sert de conclusion au Pantagruel." And the final invitation lies somewhere between Rabelais' call to partake of the divine medicine and Joyce's advertisement for a hot-gospel coughmixture: "Eh bien, pour ne pas nous compromettre, portons le fameux toast: *Diis ignotis!*" With that, "ils vidèrent leurs calices de science, de gaz carbonique, de parfums, de poésie et d'incrédulité" (XV, 52, 53).

Of course, such parallels may have resulted from the fact that two novelists, obsessed by similar modern problems and portraying the human comedy with similar encyclopaedic gusto, were looking back upon the same sixteenth-century conversation. Without knowing when Joyce read *La Peau de chagrin,* one cannot with assurance claim more. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that he was carrying yet further the principles evident in Balzac's elaboration of Rabelais. If so, both Rabelais and Balzac must join the Flaubert of *Bouvard et Pécuchet* as Joyce's French mentors in that comic alchemy which creates worlds of words from the dung heap of civilization.

Oberlin College

SIDONIA C. TAUPIN

¿Había Leído Darío A Lautréamont Cuando Lo Incluyó en *Los Raros?*

CUANDO DARÍO—después de una corta estancia en París, en 1893—empezó a publicar en *La Nación* de Buenos Aires los artículos que más tarde habían de formar el discutido libro *Los raros,* hacía poco que en Francia se había comenzado a hablar, entre "un reducidísimo grupo de iniciados" (como él dice), del Conde de Lautréamont.

No tardó en comunicar a sus lectores de América lo que él mismo había tan recientemente averiguado del "infeliz y sublime" autor de *Los cantos de Maldoror.* Y así, de los veinte ensayos que componen lo que Groussac[1] denominó esa "reunión intérlope de *Los raros*" donde "altas individualidades como Leconte de Lisle, Ibsen, Poe y el mismo Verlaine, respiran el mismo incienso y se codean con los Bloy, d'Esparbès, la histérica Rachilde, y otros *ratés* aun más innominados,"[2] uno está dedicado a ese "hombre espectral" que había muerto hacía más de veinte años totalmente desconocido.

Darío señala la novedad y la originalidad de *Los cantos de Maldoror,* libro que "sería único si no existiesen las prosas de Rimbaud." Y compara a Lautréamont con Poe: "Ambos tuvieron la visión de lo extra-

[1] *La Biblioteca* (Buenos Aires), XI (1896). Artículo reproducido en *La Lectura* (Madrid), abril 1916; y en *Nosotros* (Buenos Aires), III (1916), núm. 82.

[2] En "Los colores del estandarte," artículo publicado en *La Nación,* 27 nov. 1896, Darío da su respuesta a la severa crítica de Groussac, y dice que incluye a "Rachilde y Lautréamont por ser únicos en la historia del pensamiento universal." Aunque Groussac no menciona a Lautréamont, es evidente que Darío vió en la palabra *raté* una posible alusión a ese poeta.

natural . . . ambos experimentaron la atracción de las matemáticas."[3] Pero añade que "Poe fué celeste, y Lautréamont infernal."

El enamorado de lo raro que era en ese tiempo Darío, parece encontrar cierta complacencia en señalar el aspecto satánico y "peligroso" del autor de ese libro "diabólico y extraño, burlón y aullante, cruel y penoso"; y aconseja a la juventud que no "se abreve en esas negras aguas, por más que en ellas se refleje la maravilla de las constelaciones." —"Si yo llevase a mi musa cerca del lugar en donde el loco está enjaulado vociferando al viento," dice por su parte, "le taparía los oídos."[4]

No es precisamente suya esta última opinión respecto del desequilibrio mental del autor que presentaba, ya que los tardíos lectores de ese "monstre de livre" (como lo llamó Léon Bloy) no cesaban de afirmar que tan funesta creación como *Los cantos de Maldoror* no podía ser sino el fruto malsano e irracional que proviene de la mente de un loco. Y Bloy, con su habitual volubilidad, ya había calificado a Lautréamont de "fou," "dément," "aliéné," "maniatique," "insensé."

Aunque el mismo Bloy se había referido al "pobre loco" unos años antes en su obra *Le désespéré* (1886), fué el artículo que le dedicó el primero de septiembre de 1890 en *La Plume* el que atrajo más definitivamente la atención al poeta de *Los cantos*. Poco después, ese mismo año, apareció la primera edición publicada en Francia[5] del libro—la de Genonceaux—donde, en el prefacio, el editor trata de aclarar lo que se había considerado el "misterio"[6] de la vida y la persona de Isidore Du-

[3] Bloy, con el corrosivo sarcasmo que le caracterizaba, aludió a la vez a esa predilección de Lautréamont por las matemáticas y a sus orígenes: "L'auteur nous apprend qu'il était mathématicien et même Montévidéen, ce qui paraît impliquer une mathématique supérieure."

[4] Los animales que pueblan el mundo de Maldoror son, según Darío, "aquéllos que hacen pensar en las creaciones del Diablo: el sapo, el buho, la víbora, la araña." Pero, ¿no son claramente de la misma tenebrosa especie de la fauna maldororiana, de esas "creaciones del Diablo," los que años más tarde utiliza el cantor del cisne? En "Filosofía" de *Cantos de vida y esperanza* leemos:

"Saluda al sol, araña, no seas rencorosa,
Da tus gracias a Dios, oh sapo, pues que eres,
El peludo cangrejo tiene espinas de rosa,
Y los moluscos reminiscencias de mujeres"

y en "Tant mieux" de *El canto errante*:

"Gloria al laboratorio de Canidia,
Gloria al sapo y la araña y su veneno . . .
Gloria a la cucaracha que fastidia
Gloria al diente del can de rabia lleno . . ."

[5] Hay que recordar que el libro había sido impreso primeramente en Bélgica donde, confiaba el joven autor, "les esprits seront mieux préparés qu'en France pour savourer cette poésie de révolte." No olvidaba él—y menos los cautos editores franceses—el penible y costoso proceso contra los autores de obras como *Les Fleurs du mal* y *Madame Bovary*.

[6] Es Bloy, otra vez, el acusador cuando dice que Lautréamont oculta su vida y su pasado "avec toute la ruse compliquée d'un aliéné simulateur et larron."

casse, y de desmentir la leyenda de su locura, preconizada tan tenazmente por Bloy. Unos meses más tarde, en febrero de 1891, aparece en el *Mercure de France,* con motivo de esa nueva edición, un artículo de Rémy de Gourmont, el "querido maestro y buen amigo," como Darío ha de llamarle más adelante. Y la misma revista publica, también en ese año, una selección de las *poesías* de Lautréamont, y el acta de nacimiento del poeta.

A la luz de estos hechos, el artículo sobre Lautréamont en *Los raros* puede chocar al lector moderno y enterado por su falta de información concreta, y hasta cierto punto *divulgada,* respecto de ese autor. Y porque si se compara con el que apareció en *La Plume* parece indicar que cuanto Darío sabía de *Los cantos de Maldoror* y del "loco" que los concibió, provenía exclusivamente del artículo demolador de Bloy; y que cuando redactó el suyo, muy probablemente no había leído la obra que, como dice, "me tocó hacer conocer a América en Montevideo."

Como es natural, tratándose de un autor desconocido para el público a que destinaba su artículo, Darío cita, en español, abundantemente de *Los cantos de Maldoror.* Pero no se encuentra una sola cita que no provenga del de Bloy. Es más, queriendo ser liberal con sus lectores hispanoamericanos, no omite ninguna de las muchas que seleccionó ese autor.

Darío sembraba en buena tierra. El furor maldororiano se apoderó de los jóvenes, a pesar de sus "advertencias,"—o quizás precisamente por ellas—en Buenos Aires y, más exageradamente aún, en Montevideo.

Es fácil ver cómo nació el especial interés que mostraron los escritores de la región del Plata por el Conde de Lautréamont—independientemente del valor de su obra. Otro montevideano-francés, Laforgue, también tuvo, como sabemos, un señalado eco rioplatense. Pero en el caso del primero la relación es mucho más estrecha, ya que había formulado la audaz y tantas veces citada "profecía" del primer canto de *Maldoror,* tan halagadora para los poetas que Darío frecuentaba en aquel tiempo:

> La fin du dix-neuvième siècle verra son poète... il est né sur les rives américaines, à l'embouchure de la Plata... Buenos-Ayres, la reine du Sud, et Montevideo, la coquette, se tendent une main amie, à travers les eaux argentines du grand estuaire.

Esta cita, que no aparece en *Los raros,* ni tampoco en el artículo de Bloy, la coloca Darío más tarde como epígrafe a "Los colores del estandarte" (*La Nación,* 27 noviembre 1896) que es, como hemos dicho, una réplica a la crítica de Groussac. Y Darío la utiliza para expresar su con-

vicción de que ha de realizarse lo que el "raro visionario" predijo de la aparición del gran poeta del futuro en las tierras que baña "el gran estuario":

> Estamos, querido maestro, los poetas jóvenes de la América de lengua castellana preparando el camino, porque ha de venir nuestro Whitman, nuestro Walt Whitman indígena, lleno de mundo, saturado de universo, como el del norte, cantado tan bellamente por "nuestro Martí." Y no sería extraño que apareciese en esta vasta cosmópolis, crisol de almas y razas, en donde vivió Andrade, el de la Atlántida simbólica, y aparece este joven salvaje de Lugones, precursor quizá del anunciado por el enigmático y terrible loco montevideano, en su libro profético y espantable.

El artículo de Bloy se titula "Le cabanon de Prométhée," y ahí dice con respecto a Lautréamont: "L'auteur est mort dans un cabanon, et c'est tout ce qu'on sait de lui." Por lo tanto es significativo ver que siete años más tarde (26 noviembre 1897), y a pesar de lo que ya se sabía y se había dicho de Lautrémont, al publicar Darío un artículo en *La Nación* sobre Lugones, con motivo de *Las montañas del oro* (ya viendo al poeta argentino no como precursor, sino como portador del "milagroso centro del poeta nuevo") aun persiste en seguir a Bloy: "Pláceme ver en ti lo que el Montevideano en su cabanon presumió . . ."

Los juicios más comedidos y acertados de Rémy de Gourmont y la información documentalmente comprobada sobre la corta vida y la banal muerte de Isidore Ducasse no tienen cabida ni se vislumbran en aseveraciones como éstas de *Los raros*: "su nombre verdadero se ignora," "él se dice montevideano," "vivió desventurado y murió loco," "de la vida del autor nada se sabe." Porque "el loco enjaulado vociferando al viento" es siempre el "supplicié" de Bloy que no cesa de vociferar su desesperación.

¿Por qué no trató Darío de averiguar algo más sobre Lautréamont, el único "raro" entre los extranjeros que tenía un lazo definitivo con los poetas de Hispano-América, no por el simple hecho de haber nacido en esas tierras, sino por lo que proclamaba respecto del "poeta del futuro"; de leer por lo menos otra opinión además de la de Bloy que él mismo denomina "el monsieur de París de la literatura . . . el voluntario verdugo moral" de su generación? Bien conocía el autor de *Los raros* a ese "monje de la Santa Inquisición," a ese "profeta iracundo," a ese "demolador" y "perseguidor" que "azota, quema, raja, empala, y decapita," a ese fanático, enfín, que era Bloy—¿no lo describió así en una impresionante silueta del mismo libro?—para fiarse única y exclusivamente en su juicio sobre ese extraño autor que merecía su interés.

¿Fué porque cuando cayó en sus manos el artículo de Bloy en un número atrasado de *La Plume*—que quizás leyó en París, o en Buenos

Aires—Darío vió que Lautréamont era un verdadero "raro," y se apresuró a presentarlo a sus lectores de *La Nación* sin más buscar? Además, parece que en esa época aun no leía el *Mercure de France,* cuya publicación había comenzado justamente en 1890, año del artículo de *La Plume.* Y evidentemente no conocía la edición de Genonceaux porque en *Los raros* dice: "El poema de Lautréamont se publicó hace diez y siete años en Bélgica." Y añade que el libro es "inencontrable."

El hecho de que Darío se ocupara del comparativamente desconocido Lautréamont al lado de figuras ya consagradas como Poe, Verlaine y Leconte de Lisle, podía ser una indicación de hasta qué punto su instinto —como al descubrir en el luchador Martí al "poeta, poeta siempre" —le hizo llegar a ser en este caso, como en tantos otros, un precursor. Pero hay que ser imparciales. Es indudable que al escoger algunos de sus "raros" Darío se dejó llevar por la novelería. Y así presentaba ante los jóvenes de América, ávidos de manjar nuevo, ciertos platos fuertes que, como les advertía, no sin cierto orgullo y satisfacción, no podían saborear "los comedores de pan sin sal." El poder apreciar la obra de aquéllos que en París mismo eran condenados por "el papado de lo mediocre" y "los porosos fabricantes de crítica exegética" los colocaba entre la *élite,* la aristocracia intelectual, como él no cesaba de reiterar. Por lo tanto se complacía a veces en darles muestras de esas "plantas enfermas" que tan abundantemente brotaban en esa época en el seno de "la adorada Francia"—por lo que fué fuertemente censurado.[7]

Siendo eso así, podríamos entonces suponer que la inclusión de Lautréamont fué un accidente fortuito, y que su interés en "el loco montevideano" se debía a una de esas "explosiones de la primavera" a las que se refiere en la segunda edición de *Los raros,* que fueron sucedidas—y rectificadas—por "la razón autumnal." Pero eso tampoco parece ser cierto en este caso. Cuando en 1915 se encontraba Darío en Guatemala, poco antes de encaminarse al cementerio de su "Nicaragua natal," el entonces joven y novel escritor Arévalo Martínez le pidió tímidamente su opinión sobre su nueva obra, *El hombre que parecía un caballo.* Y Rubén, después de leerla, le dijo gravemente:

> ¿Crees en mí? ... Entonces apunta este nombre que voy a pronunciar: Lautréamont. El Conde de Lautréamont. Y apunta este otro nombre que es el de su única obra: *Los cantos de Maldoror.* Lautréamont es el único poeta, y su obra es la única obra, que dan, aunque sea con vaguedad, un precedente a tu obra de maravilla. En mi libro *Los raros* encontrarás algunas noticias sobre él. Tu obra estupenda, fuera del caso único del terrible Conde, no tiene igualdades, ni analogías, ni precedencias ...[8]

[7] Groussac ve a Darío "convertido en heraldo de pseudo-talentos decadentes," y dice que "celebra la grandeza de sus mirmidones con una sinceridad afligente."
[8] R. Arévalo Martínez, en *Diario de Centro América,* 28 de julio 1928.

Vemos, pues, que ya cara a cara con la muerte, cuando casi ha llegado el momento supremo de "la verdad," y mucho antes de la consagración definitiva de Lautréamont, es el nombre de ese poeta el que pronuncia ante el escritor guatemalteco, que veinte años después de la primera aparición de *Los raros* aun ignoraba el nombre del que Darío consideraba su único predecesor.

Sirvan estas notas meramente para señalar un presunto hecho, y no para minimizar la enorme aportación de Darío, no ya como creador de una nueva manera de hacer versos, sino como asiduo y eficaz divulgador de la literatura universal de su tiempo. A través de sus numerosos artículos y crónicas cambió, no pocas veces, el rumbo del gusto literario hispánico. Si cuando escribió su artículo sobre Lautréamont no había tenido—o no había buscado—la ocasión de conocer mejor a ese gran "raro," no se mostró en ese respecto menos avisado que otros, ya que muchos eran los que aun en Francia, y desde luego en la mayoría de los países de Europa, no habían todavía oído "les gémissements graves du Montévidéen." El artículo de Darío fué para su época, y entre los jóvenes escritores de lengua española, una gran revelación.

La influencia posterior de Lautréamont, sobretodo entre los ultraístas uruguayos, se debe, sin duda, más que al artículo de *Los raros,* al impacto del surrealismo, y la celebridad del "montevideano" entre esos autores. Pero la primera boga de *Los cantos de Maldoror* nace de la incompleta cuenta que de ese libro dió Rubén Darío. A él se debe, como dice Maurice Saillet,[9] "la restitución memorable" del Conde de Lautréamont "a su continente de origen."

Hunter College

[9] Un largo estudio de Saillet, "Les Inventeurs de Maldoror," apareció en la revista *Les Lettres nouvelles,* 1954, nos. 14, 15, 16 y 17. Traza el autor la evolución de los conocimientos maldororianos en Francia desde sus principos. De especial interés es la mención final del "périple américain" donde alaba la contribución de Darío, pero sin suscitar los puntos que aquí nos ocupan, ni aludir a la deuda que Darío debió a Bloy. Por error da la fecha de la segunda edición—1905—como la de la publicación de *Los raros* (1896), atrasando así unos diez años la temprana contribución de Darío a la crítica extranjera sobre Lautréamont. Y como los comienzos del interés mundial en el Conde nacen, segun él, del artículo de Rémy de Gourmont, Saillet también supone, equivocadamente, que a él le debe Darío su descubrimiento de Lautréamont.

BOOK REVIEWS

DEUTSCHLAND-FRANKREICH. Ludwigsburger Beiträge zum Problem der deutsch-französischen Beziehungen. Vol. II. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1957. 472 p.

The second volume of the *Deutschland-Frankreich* series sponsored by the Deutsch-Französisches Institut in Ludwigsburg follows in the main the four divisions of the first volume, reviewed in this journal by Professor Bieber (VII, 275-280). The first division, "Das politische Problem," has been amplified by the addition of economic questions. The second section, "Zur Revision des deutsch-französischen Geschichtsbildes," continues the pattern set by the first volume, as does the third section, "Die geistig-kulturellen Wechselbeziehungen." The fourth and very considerable part extends the bibliography initiated in Vol. I to publications in the years 1953 through 1955 relating not only to literature and general culture but also to politics, economics, sociology, law, language, philosophy, etc.; but the fine arts are not yet admitted. The bibliographical subsections cover German (also Austrian and Swiss) publications on France, French publications on Germany, contemporary German belletristic works concerned with Franco-German problems, and relevant dictionaries. Dissertations are included; newspaper articles, translations, and reviews are excluded. The bibliography is objective; it contains no descriptive or critical remarks. Two supplements are announced for the near future: an index for and addendum to Vol. I, to be contained in a *Zwölfjahresbibliographie Deutschland-Frankreich*, and, separately, a list of relevant dissertations for the years 1945 to 1952.

While gratefully acknowledging the enlarged offerings of the volume, one is obliged to note that the contributions are very uneven in theme, length, and quality. Odds and ends alternate with substantial and unified articles. The *pièce de résistance* of this series, the chapter on "Geistig-kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen" in Vol. I, contained writings on broad subjects encompassing (with a single exception) France *and* Germany. The corresponding chapter in Vol. II is divided into two disproportionate slices. The first part is represented by just two items, Wilhelm Hausenstein's "conférence d'occasion" on "Goethe et la France," which is little more than a simple enumeration of well-known facts mechanically strung together, and a splendid study on "Stefan George und die Gesellschaft" by Claude David, which is, however, not particularly comparative in nature. The entire second part, entitled "Begegnungen mit der französischen Sprache und Literatur," is a Festschrift in honor of Professor Julius Wilhelm (Tübingen) consisting of nineteen articles. It contains, besides literary contributions, translations from the French, a five-page abstract from a philosophical thesis, two linguistic articles, a collection of lexicographic remarks, and the text of a petition by German scholars in the Romance field concerning the respective merits of French and English in the German secondary-school curriculum. Of the thirteen literary studies only five are comparative, the others being simply studies on

French literature by German scholars. Hence the overall impression of disparateness, notwithstanding the high caliber of most of the constituents of the volume.

It is therefore no reflection on the standards of the individual contributors if we concentrate in this review on truly comparative literary items. Among the essays thus barred from more detailed consideration are some outstanding pieces: in the political arena, reflections by Carlo Schmid, Robert Schuman, and René Mayer on Franco-German relations, and Ulrich Doertenbach's useful collection of reciprocal clichés and half-truths encumbering fruitful contacts; in historiography, the admirably judicious "Zur Revision des deutsch-französichen Geschichtsbildes" by Jacques Droz, illuminating what is perhaps the most far-reaching and gratifying result of postwar Franco-German cooperation—an agreement reached by French and German teachers of history concerning what and what not to teach their pupils about the other country, in the interest of truth and good will; and, in the field of literary scholarship, such solid examples of insight and workmanship as Fritz Neubert's "Die Memoiren des P.-F. Marmontel," Franz Rauhut's "Albert Camus, oder vom Nihilismus zu Mass und Menschenliebe," and Kurt Wais' "Alexis Léger (Saint-John Perse): Leben und Werk."

Jean René Derré exploits a bonanza of the first magnitude in culling and organizing Benjamin Constant's notes on Germany (1804-14) from his *Journaux intimes*, published for the first time in their entirety several years ago. As a literary critic, especially of the drama, Constant carried on the traditional bias of the French eighteenth century. Neither *Emilia Galotti* ("... froideur ... dissertations assez fines, mais ... déplacées") nor *Wilhelm Tell* ("... une lanterne magique mal arrangée"), neither *Iphigenie* nor *Faust* ("... une dérision de l'espèce humaine ... mauvais goût") could dent his classicistic armor. Constant's attachment to the worldly "Age of Light" determined other judgments as well. He disliked Friedrich Schlegel's incipient Catholicism, he derided August Wilhelm Schlegel's clumsiness in society and his remoteness from practical and especially political reality ("... un homme de lettres, qu'une vie de cabinet a rendu faible de corps et d'âme ..., qui, n'ayant jamais rien eu à faire avec la vie réelle, croit qu'on fait tout par des ordonnances et des lois." (As Constant speaks one hears his "Minette," Madame de Staël.) The French cult of clarity shows in his objection to Schelling's "inintelligible langage."

Like others, Constant observes that the extraordinary fund of knowledge possessed by German thinkers does not seem to lead them to clear, let alone striking conclusions but actually impedes them. Still, it is the discovery of the breadth and depth of German scholarship that lies at the roots of Constant's firmly positive reaction to Germany. He grows ecstatic about German libraries (Göttingen, Weimar), about the seriousness, thoroughness, and progressiveness of German thought, and about the personal modesty, the *bonhomie* of her scholars as contrasted with the flashiness and provincialism of contemporary French thinkers: "[Le] Français ... regarde tout ce qui n'est pas la France comme hérissé de forêts et couvert de glace ... Vrais Chinois que nous sommes dans nos connaissances des autres pays." Repeatedly his snap condemnations of German philosophers give way to sympathetic fairness (Herder, Schelling, Schleiermacher). When he met Alexander von Humboldt, who combined substance, form, and personality, scholarship and worldliness, Constant recognized in him an almost ideal type of the savant. It was with sadness, and with a jab at his own

country, that he left Germany, "le seul pays où la vérité soit un but et où la littérature soit autre chose qu'un moyen, chez les meilleurs de briller, et chez le reste de plaire."

We can offer only a few samples of Constant's masterly firsthand personal sketches. Goethe: "(23 janvier 1804). Vu Goethe. Finesse, amour-propre, irritabilité physique jusqu'a la souffrance, esprit remarquable, beau regard, figure un peu dégradée." Schelling: "Un petit monsieur, le nez en l'air, l'œil fixe, âpre et vif, le sourire amer, la voix sèche, parlant peu, écoutant avec une attention qui ne flatte point... enfin donnant tout à fait l'idée, pour son caractère, d'une méchanceté active, et pour son esprit, de la fatuité française, avec la métaphysique allemande." Friedrich Schlegel: "(2 octobre 1804). C'est un petit homme rond, gras outre mesure, avec un nez pointu qui sort de deux joues luisantes, et une bouche qui sourit assez mielleusement sous ce nez pointu, de beaux yeux, un air subalterne, surtout quand il ne parle pas, et une mine de glace quand il écoute."

Johannes Hösle arrives at largely negative results in his essay on "Die deutsche Literatur von Goethes Tod bis zum Ausgang des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts im Spiegel der französischen Kritik von 1900 bis 1914." There has been interest in France in Hebbel, object of lively debate after 1907, and, of course, in Heine, but little interest in such writers as Droste, Immermann, Mörike, Büchner, Grabbe, Ludwig, Raabe, the Austrians (Grillparzer, Lenau, Stifter, etc.), or the Swiss (Gotthelf, Keller, Meyer). *Jungdeutschland* and sociologically oriented German literature (Gutzkow, Freytag, Spielhagen, and Fontane) found a capable interpreter in Joseph Dresch, and more impressionistic literature in Theodor de Wyzewa, but there was to be on Saint-René Taillandier after 1900.

Hösle's conclusion that German literary influences on France in the period he treats run a poor third to Nietzsche and Wagner is forcefully illustrated in a fair and thoughtful article on "Romain Rolland et Nietzsche" that has profited from much unpublished material made accessible by Rolland's widow. René Cheval, its author, points up Rolland's ambivalent relationship to Nietzsche: fervent admiration for his idol-shattering insurgence, his fearless depth-plumbing, his "solitude libre," but grave reservations about his disciples, about Nietzscheism, its "force barbare et raffinée," its "germes de folie... délire d'orgueil... volonté malade" accompanying an "incontestable puissance." "Un surhomme est un spectacle sublime. Dix ou vingt surhommes commencent à devenir gênants." But "il n'est pas permis de nier le soleil, même si le soleil vous blesse. (D'autant moins.)"

Richard Thieberger's "Französische Einstreuungen im Werk Thomas Manns" is only a good beginning on a topic that has been investigated more systematically elsewhere (Joel Hunt, "The Stylistics of a Foreign Language: Thomas Mann's Use of French," *Germanic Review*, XXXII, Feb. 1957, 19-34).

Finally, Hermann Karl Weinert works up a tremendous amount of material in tracing the encounter between representative French and German men and women in the fiction and drama of Germany from World War I to the 1950s. His findings underscore the Francophile tendencies of present-day Germany. So does the entire volume of which his contribution is a part. Sensitive and understanding affection for her neighbor gives this German book an exemplary unity of tone, reinforced by the noble external appearance of what is clearly a labor of love.

HENRY H. H. REMAK

Indiana University

GEORGE MOORE ET LA FRANCE. By Georges-Paul Collet. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz; Paris: Librairie Minard, 1957. 231 p.

L'étude de M. Collet retiendra l'attention de tous ceux qui, tôt ou tard, ont rencontré sur leur route l'auteur d'*Esther Waters*, du *Brook Kerith*, ou encore des *Memoirs of my Dead Life*. Elle nous fait voir un George Moore entièrement "conditionné"—si l'on peut dire—par la France. C'est au contact de la France et de ses écrivains que s'est révélée la vocation littéraire de cet Irlandais venu à Paris pour y faire de la peinture. Mais sept ans de séjour dans la capitale ont transformé l'apprenti-peintre en apprenti-auteur. "Il est difficile, déclare M. Collet, d'imaginer ce qu'aurait été l'œuvre de l'écrivain irlandais si elle n'avait passé au creuset de la terre gauloise. Ce fut le bonheur de George Moore d'avoir été le témoin du Paris brillant[1] de 1880. Il trouva là son chemin de Damas, pour reprendre une image qui lui était chère" (p. 213). Et M. Collet termine en citant Louis Gillet: "C'était un jongleur, un de ces trouvères d'autrefois qui, après avoir séjourné à la cour et dans les châteaux de la Champagne ou de la Provence, s'en revenaient dans leur pays charmer des oreilles avides de contes et de romans à la mode de France" *(Ibid.)*.

Les premiers chapitres de l'étude sont d'ordre biographique. Ils présentent George Moore dans son pays natal d'abord, puis en France. Ils font vivre devant nous cet Irlandais original et énigmatique, nature fougueuse, dominée par un intense instinct de vie et un besoin inné d'échapper à toute contrainte, mais dont la volonté était réglée par le désir et dont l'égoïsme farouche n'hésitait pas à se servir—à ses propres fins—de ses amis mêmes. En 1880, âgé de 28 ans, George Moore rentra en Angleterre. Il se consacra dès lors à la littérature. C'est après ce retour au pays que se placent ses amitiés françaises les plus marquantes: Zola, Jacques-Emile Blanche, Edouard Dujardin, Daniel Halévy et Louis Gillet entre autres. Comme auteur, George Moore fut reconnu en France avant de l'être en Angleterre. En 1932, il devait écrire à son ami Gillet: "Il a fallu que j'aille en France pour y trouver des critiques qui voulussent bien me reconnaître comme le meilleur prosateur anglais vivant" (p. 48). En effet, George Moore a toujours eu meilleure presse en France qu'Outre-Manche. Cela s'explique en partie par son attitude qui, foncièrement, était celle d'un esthète[2] et par là plus proche de celle des milieux littéraires français de l'époque que de ceux d'Angleterre; en partie également par une manie de scandaliser ses lecteurs, tant dans le domaine littéraire que dans le domaine moral, qui devait forcément lui aliéner les sympathies d'un public offensé dans ses conventions.

La Deuxième Partie de l'étude de M. Collet, essentiellement documentaire, montre le place considérable que la France occupe dans l'œuvre de George Moore: que ce soit dans les ouvrages autobiographiques et de critique d'art, ou dans les préfaces, les articles et autres écrits, partout se retrouvent des tableaux de la France, des jugements sur ses artistes, peintres et auteurs.

Cela mène tout naturellement à la dernière partie de l'étude, celle des "Influences françaises." Des trois, c'est, à notre avis, la moins satisfaisante.

[1] Appliquée au Paris de 1880, l'épithète nous paraît fort discutable.

[2] Cf. "Je suis, voyez-vous, une espèce de moine de la littérature" (p. 39). "Ici repose George Moore qui considérait la perfection de la parole écrite comme l'unique moralité" (p. 210). Qu'on compare avec ces déclarations de l'auteur lui-même, certains jugements de la presse du temps sur "les obscénités préraphaélites" (p. 139) de cet "Anglais parisianisé, efféminé et pervers" (p. 140).

L'auteur y passe en revue—et dans cet ordre—les influences de: Gautier; Zola, avec qui Moore a fini par rompre; Flaubert; les Goncourt; Balzac, qui a été de toutes l' "influence" la plus constante; Huysmans, avec lequel Moore a voulu rivaliser; Dujardin enfin, dont l'emprise sur l'écrivain anglais a sans doute été la plus grande. Une série de chapitres—un chapitre par auteur—est ainsi consacrée à un jeu de dépistage fort habile mais aussi fort lassant. Cette recherche des sources—ce dépistage des influences—n'est-ce pas là en soi un jeu plutôt désuet à notre époque? L'auteur se défend bien de jouer "le jeu cruel de la comparaison" (p. 181), mais c'est précisément à ce jeu qu'il se livre en procédant à une confrontation de textes inlassable. D'où résultent pour le lecteur fatigue, monotonie, voire ennui. Etre consciencieux à l'extrême quand il s'agit du travail de recherche, à la bonne heure; mais dans l'exposé des résultats, que le savant fasse grâce au lecteur des moindres bribes de savoir qu'il a si soigneusement accumulées. Ici, pousser la conscience jusqu'à ses frontières ultimes, c'est tomber dans le pédantisme. Quelques exemples bien choisis suffisent; le reste lasse davantage qu'il ne convainc. Non que les exemples-échantillons supplémentaires manquent d'intérêt ou de valeur, mais ils seraient mieux à leur place dans un Appendice où pourraient aller les chercher spécialistes et curieux.

La Conclusion compte parmi les meilleures pages de l'étude. Dominant son sujet, M. Collet y réussit en particulier à profiler son auteur sur l'Angleterre du temps (voir p. 210) et à établir un bilan sommaire de l'apport de la France à l'art de George Moore (voir p. 213).

Dans l'ensemble, l'étude souffre de ce qui paraît être un véritable parti-pris—conscient ou inconscient—de la part de l'auteur: tout ce qui est français, tout ce qui touche à la France de près ou de loin, ou encore porte la marque de son influence, est présenté comme nécessairement supérieur. *George Moore et la France* est un véritable péan, mais à l'honneur de la France et non de Moore, comme on aurait pu s'y attendre. C'est là encore un élément qui contribue à la note fastidieuse déjà relevée plus haut. Si ce parti-pris est pour le moins regrettable, cependant ce que nous reprochons le plus à l'auteur, c'est d'être resté—dans une étude poussée jusque dans les moindres détails, claire d'ailleurs, bien ordonnée et appuyée d'une bibliographie qui rendra service aux lecteurs—c'est d'être resté en quelque sorte à la surface de son sujet. Confrontation de paragraphes, rapprochement de mots, de phrases, d'images, reportage même de déclarations de l'écrivain, tout cela ne fournit que les éléments concrets et en quelque sorte extérieurs du problème. Ce qu'on voudrait voir—et qu'on ne voit pas assez—c'est ce que la France est devenue dans le Moore le plus intime, dans quelle mesure les "influences" subies ont fait dès lors partie intégrante de l'écrivain, de ses conceptions, de son talent même[3], en un mot le "miel" qui est le produit des pollens variés butinés çà et là. On nous rappelle bien, il est vrai, que "la leçon essentielle que G. Moore emporta de Paris, c'est la notion de la valeur suprême et de l'importance de l'art" (p. 50). Mais encore! Et à notre époque où l'écrivain tend à être *engagé*, la conception que Moore se faisait de l'art, libéré de toute préoccupation morale, fin en soi et sa propre justification, cette conception a quelque chose de nettement *passé*. C'est dans le cadre des décandentistes et de leur manière souvent exquise mais, trop souvent aussi, guindée, voire précieuse, que George Moore s'inscrit le mieux. Aussi est-il difficile de le goûter aujourd'hui, et on a l'impression que

[3] Il est intéressant de noter que, tout comme Conrad, George Moore a failli faire du français sa langue littéraire (voir p. 43).

M. Collet, quelque soin qu'il apporte à juger favorablement son héros, s'en rend bien compte lui-même. Un fait est certain: au-dessus de l'amas de faits présentés, c'est un Moore-fantôme qui flotte, abstrait, presque irréel. A quand un George Moore vraiment vivant?

JACQUELINE S. DE LA HARPE

University of California

LES "ARCHIVES LITTÉRAIRES DE L'EUROPE" (1804-1808) ET LE COSMOPOLITISME LITTÉRAIRE SOUS LE PREMIER EMPIRE. By Roland Mortier. Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1957. 251 p. (Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, Mémoires, tome LI, fascicule 4.)

Mortier's study is squarely loyal to the tradition of French *comparatisme*. He has chosen a concrete, carefully restricted topic from literary history—in this case, a rather short-lived periodical serving as an intermediary between certain foreign cultures and France and has systematically explored and probably exhausted the subject from all angles: precursors, "ambiance," publication data, diffusion, collaborators, program, and the recognition given it by literary history, followed by chapters dealing with the *Archives'* attention to and evaluation of German, English, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Danish, and French literatures. A final summary, a bibliography, and an alphabetical index conclude the offerings.

One must immediately pose the question whether the quality, influence, or historical value of the periodical merited so extensive a scrutiny. The answer is a qualified "yes." The literary and philosophical criticism of the *Archives*, judging from Mortier's ample quotations, is distinguished by fairness rather than penetration and seems to limit itself more often than not to a "distribution d'éloges et de blâmes." Flashes of keener analysis are rare. The *Archives* are, however, highly representative of their period and intellectual environment, and their historical interest is enhanced by an atypical lack of prejudice. Mortier should have condensed some quotations and, on occasions, refrained from verbalizing the obvious. Although he is not blind to the defects of the *Archives* and prudently shuns exaggerated claims in their behalf, he is generous in his praise and tends to glide quickly over the copious plaudits for second- and third-rate authors. One could say of him what he says of Bourgoing: "Ses jugements sont généralement justes et ne pèchent que par excès de bienveillance" (p. 198). He writes lucidly, without affectation but not without finesse, and is free from nationalistic bias.

The character of the *Archives* is perhaps best illustrated by their attitude to German literature and philosophy. The obstacles faced in breaching French notions of philosophical self-sufficiency and introducing German metaphysics to their compatriots are concisely expressed by the *Archives'* writers. Charles de Villers ascribes France's cultural isolation to her preoccupation with political issues, whereas Germany's insulation from the Revolution allowed her literature and philosophy to expand freely. "Nous nous sommes tellement et si solidement établis sur le terrain des réalités sensibles que nous regardons comme illusoire toutes réalités d'un autre ordre... Nous avons perdu... cette plénitude et cette agilité de la vie intellectuelle, qui nous rend capables de plonger tour à tour et de respirer également dans le double élément auquel notre nature participe." The French public has placed such importance on the lucidity and communicability of a philosophical system that, according to Guizot, French *esprit* has lost in depth what

it has gained in clarity: "Le vrai philosophe, uniquement occupé de la recherche de la vérité, ne songe, au moment où il s'y livre, ni au public qui doit le juger, ni à ses goûts, ni à ses opinions, ni à son caractère. Oserai-je dire que cette manière de philosopher, la seule bonne, la seule raisonnable, est presque inconnue parmi nous?" Degérando scores French indifference to foreign philosophies in his prefatory discourse to the *Archives*. Schweighäuser contributes to the first volume a survey of contemporary German philosophy (Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schleiermacher, F. H. Jacobi), which is followed in the same year by Villers' fervent obituary of Kant. One must not overestimate, however, the perspicacity of the *Archives* editors; Mortier notes that Degérando, one of the French experts on German philosophy, states his preference for a number of contemporary German philosophers (Jacobi, Platner, Eberhard, Sulzer, Mérian, Ancillon, Rosenstein, Garve), of whom all but Jacobi are virtually forgotten today.

There is a similar lack of perspective in the *Archives'* evaluation of German literature. J. G. Jacobi is considered the most representative poet of Germany, and the opinion is expressed that Iffland and Kotzebue will be more durable than Goethe and Schiller. Second- and third-rate writers receive disproportionate attention, viz. Bronner, Pfeffel, August Lafontaine, and Ramdohr. (Musäus, whom Mortier lumps together with these as "sombrés depuis dans l'oubli le plus total et le plus mérité," deserves a higher place.) The romantic school (the Schlegels, Tieck, Kleist) find only feeble echoes, and Zacharias Werner baffles the editors. Still, the *Archives* offered badly needed selections of German literature and philosophy in translation, usually with more or less enlightening commentaries. An excellent feature is the French translation of important German literary criticism (e.g., Bouterwek).

The most widely represented and much revered contemporary German author is Wieland (although his novels are ignored), followed by Schiller. Qualitatively, Mortier ranks first the articles devoted to Herder, Klopstock, and Schiller. It is Schiller the historian and essayist who is translated and appreciated; the "manque de précision" of his theoretical writings troubles his capable translator, Charles Vanderbourg. Although he had been able earlier to translate, with scrupulous fidelity, the text of Lessing's *Laokoon* (which he thought much superior to Schiller's theoretical writings), Vanderbourg confesses, in translating Schiller, that "il m'a fallu quelquefois mettre dans ses idées plus d'ordre et de clarté." He also feels compelled to supplement Schiller's scanty illustrations (most of which were restricted to English literature, barely known to French readers) with some of his own; even so Vanderbourg is worried lest Schiller should appear to the French reader as "un peu trop métaphysique." Schiller and Goethe (who rates little attention) as dramatists are criticized for the same alleged failing—having written dramas for reading rather than for the stage. The *Archives* critic completely misses the point in *Götz* and *Don Carlos*. The *Archives* presented the first rounded survey of Herder that appeared in France. Degérando pays a warm and reverent homage to the philosopher, the moralist, the friend of humanity (1804), and Guizot to the historian (1808). Herder's stylistic peculiarities and his folkloristic interests are found much less appealing.

Mortier's data and statements are generally accurate. However, in order to give the *Archives* their just due, he sometimes overdramatizes their achievements. An example is his assertion that, prior to the interest shown in Klopstock by the *Archives*, the German bard was almost unknown to the French reading public (p. 87). This does not seem to be consonant with the facts. There are translations

of and references to Klopstock by Junker and Antelmy (in *Année litteraire* and the *Journal étranger*), by Petitpierre and Therese von Kurzrock—all earlier than the *Archives*. Mortier refers briefly to this material which seems to cast doubt on his view. There is also the prose translation of excerpts from Cantos I to III of the *Messias* published in the *Journal helvétique* (December 1748) at the instigation of Bodmer; there are translations (by Antelmy) of parts of the second canto of the *Messias*, preceded by generous praise, in the *Journal des Savants* (September 1763); there is the report that Diderot was impressed with the "quiet sublimity" of Klopstock's epic masterpiece. As early as 1761 the *Journal étranger* had presented excerpts from Klopstock's drama, *Der Tod Adams*, accompanied by enthusiastic comments. Shortly thereafter (1762) a prose translation by the Abbé Roman appeared, and in 1770 an adaptation by the Abbé de Saint-Ener, both accompanied by warm tributes to the author, which were commented on by such periodicals as the *Année littéraire* or the *Journal encyclopédique*. There followed adaptations by Madame de Genlis (1785) and Villemain d'Ablancourt (1787). *La mort d'Adam* is said to have been a favorite of Napoleon. The *Hermannsschlacht* was translated by Bauvin in 1767, performed as *Les Chérusques* by the "comédiens ordinaires du roi" in 1772, and published in the same year.

The French press took grateful notice of Klopstock's initial enthusiasm for the cause of the Revolution. A French translation of his "Die Etats Généraux" found its way into the *Correspondance littéraire*. The *Journal de Paris* published a French version of *Der Fürst und sein Kebsweib*. In August 1792, despite the almost insurmountable obstacle presented to French ears and tongues by his name ("Clovestoque"!), Klopstock was made a citizen of France by the National Assembly, along with Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and Tom Paine. Karl-Friedrich Cramer, dismissed from the University of Kiel in 1794 for his Jacobinism, went to Paris a year later and advertised his passion for Klopstock in personal contacts with Sieyès and Mercier as well as in various writings, including a translation (with Blanvillain) of the *Hermannsschlacht* (1799), which was preceded by an appreciation of the master. Marie-Joseph Chénier put the ode "Hermann und Thusnelda" into French in the same year. In 1801 the *Décade philosophique* came out with prose translations of "Heinrich der Vogler," "Das Rosenband," and "Der Zürchersee." The following year Klopstock was honored by an invitation to associate membership in the Institut de France. Without, then, minimizing the earnest but perhaps anachronistic efforts made in Klopstock's behalf by the *Archives* (one wonders with what results), they certainly did not introduce him to the French public.[1]

For the student of the whole complex of Franco-German literary relations, the appraisals of individual German writers in the *Archives* will be valuable primarily as illustrations of recurrent trends. There is the phenomenon of the simultaneous appreciation by the French of two German authors for precisely opposite reasons—the bold innovations of Klopstock arouse French curiosity while Wieland is cherished as an ally against *Sturm und Drang*, whose tendencies endangered the French values of *mesure, clarté, ordre, règle*. The rediscovery of Klopstock and Wieland as late as 1804-08 points up the time lag in these relations,

[1] Mortier could have strengthened his elaborate and convincing argument that the author of the important article "Sur Klopstock et la Messiade" in the *Archives* (1804) was Bourgoing rather than Basset (the name proposed by Baldensperger) by referring to Bourgoing's translation of Klopstock's "Etats généraux" ode in Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire* (ed. Tourneux), XVI, 50-51.

since it was just at this time that a renowned German periodical (*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, February 21, 1807) claimed that Klopstock was an illustrious author whom nobody read any longer. One notices also the eagerness of the *Archives*' writers to overcome the French notion, created by *Werther*, that German literature glorified adultery and suicide. The position taken by Vanderbourg is that French literature has been enriched by the consecutive influx of classical, Italian, and English contributions; that these sources have been exploited; and that France must now turn to Germany for new ideas—"leurs défauts étant assez souvent l'excès des qualités qui nous manquent." And we witness the striking spectacle of the *Archives* coming to the rescue of certain German writers in the face of severe *German* criticism! At the same time, a deliberate caution was imposed upon the "retenue instinctive" of the *Archives* contributors by political considerations and by their fear of the "manie d'innover," the "folies paradoxales," and the "romanticism" of German literature. Hence their distaste not only for Tieck and Zacharias Werner but also for the dramas of Schiller, who it is asserted should have stuck to poetry and history. Mortier makes the sound point that the clairvoyance of the *Archives* in recognizing German pre-eminence in the lyrical genre as early as 1805 was facilitated by their uncompromising faithfulness to the French classical drama.

Much less credit is due the *Archives* for their dissemination of other literatures. English literature suffers particularly, ostensibly for political reasons. Except for a major article on Ossian and some interest in Thomson and Collins (again the time lag operates), there is nothing deserving of mention; Shakespeare is practicaly ignored. Italian literature is likewise neglected (apart from Alfieri). Spanish literature fares better, thanks to the romantic character of the Spanish drama. Dutch and Danish literary matters receive incidental attention and there is some interest in Sanskrit.

We should like to agree with Mortier, that "les *Archives* ont contribué pour une grande part à éclairer le public français d'élite sur les grands mouvements littéraires de l'étranger, mais surtout de l'Allemagne" (p. 232). However, before granting complete assent, we should require more information as to the number and stature of the readers of the *Archives* throughout the rather brief life of the periodical. Can a genuine connection be established, for example, between this journal and the Coppet circle of Madame de Staël? Whatever the answer, we are grateful for the conscientious probity of Mortier's study, and hope that we may have studies of other French periodicals (e.g., the *Mercure de France*, the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, the *Revue de Paris*) of equally high quality.

HENRY H. H. REMAK

Indiana University

ESSAIS SUR DIDEROT ET L'ANTIQUITÉ. Jean Seznec. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. 149 p., 80 reproductions.

Mr. Seznec manages, in these essays, to bring to life for the reader not only Diderot's personality and his vast knowledge of antiquity, but also much of the eighteenth century's understanding of antiquity and a large sector of the art of the period. Mr. Seznec is, of course, highly qualified to undertake this project,

since he is in the process of publishing Diderot's *Salons*[1] with the reproductions of the paintings discussed in them. But it would be wrong to regard the present book as merely a byproduct of his more extended studies on the *Salons*. It is well focused on its main theme and must be considered an independent study.

The book contains six lectures given at Bryn Mawr in 1955. While keeping the informal quality of lectures, which permits him to be selective rather than exhaustive with regard to his material, Mr. Seznec has added long and learned footnotes, an index, and, of course, reproductions of the paintings which he used with the lectures. These reproductions are the least satisfactory part of the book. They are often too small and too dark to make it possible to discern the details important for the context—too often one must read the text to learn what is in the picture. Some of the paintings shown are of minor aesthetic interest. Their importance is historical; they serve mainly to illustrate Diderot's *Salons*, and precisely because this is their function we need to be able to distinguish the details.

It may be argued that Diderot did not really contribute much to the interest in antiquity in the mid-century; however, Mr. Seznec places the theme in the larger context of the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, pointing out that, after the victory of the Moderns and in spite of Diderot's extreme "modernity," antiquity was still present in everybody's mind; indeed the ancient texts and works of art gained new life through Diderot's enthusiasm and broad knowledge. Among the *philosophes*, Diderot was the only one who insisted on the importance of taking the ancients as models of nobility, grandeur, and grace. But this insistence never dimmed Diderot's clear and critical view of present and even future problems.

Some of Diderot's efforts seem odd or misplaced, as in the Diderot-Falconet debate on ancient paintings—which Mr. Seznec treats with a sense of humor. The debate was purely theoretical and centered on descriptions by Pliny and Pausanias of long-lost ancient paintings. Diderot's invectives against the Conte de Caylus and his antiquarian taste—or lack of it—are also described with a kindly humor, as are his not always pertinent efforts at educating painters.

One trend of Diderot's endeavors is of particular interest. He tried seriously to change the taste of the painters from the sweet, rococo concept of antiquity to a sterner, more classical view. Mr. Seznec has chosen as his cover picture Vien's painting of Ares and Aphrodite, for which Diderot furnished a detailed directive description—a painting in which we can perceive the development of taste toward David, whom, as a young painter, Diderot greeted with enthusiasm. Mr. Seznec also gives proper emphasis to Diderot's concern for moral values, which, for the *philosophe*, could never be separated from the aesthetic. His first chapter, with its discussion of Socrates and his importance for Diderot's life and thinking, is therefore the most appealing in the entire book.

With elegance and finesse Mr. Seznec introduces the principal European figures who, around the middle of the eighteenth century, were preoccupied with the problem of classical antiquity. There is an excellent brief passage on Gibbon who, in contrast to Diderot, defended the antiquarian curiosity of the scholars. Mr. Seznec analyzes the climate of thought out of which Lessing's *Laocoön* developed, and makes the observation—which few would deny—that Diderot's knowledge of the techniques of painting made his discussion of the limits of poetry

[1] *Salons*. Texte établi et présenté par J. Seznec et J. Adhémar. Oxford, 1957—. So far only the first of the four volumes planned has been published.

and painting less cumbersome than Lessing's. Only Winckelmann manages to irritate Mr. Seznec, with his rather childish attacks on the French; the discussion of Winckelmann lacks the magnanimous objectivity of the rest of the book.[2]

Not the least charming part of the book are the ingenious chapter headings. There is something very appealing in titles like "Le Socrate imaginaire," "L'Ombre de Tirésias," "Le Singe anticaire," and "Le Génie du paganism." There are many digressions without which the book would be less rich, digressions rather in the manner of Diderot, but controlled by the author—who guides the reader, as it were, with tongue in cheek. The spiritual kinship between Diderot and his interpreter is felt throughout; when Mr. Seznec comes to the conclusion that what made Diderot's relation to antiquity so valuable is the fact that he lived it and loved it, we feel that the author has precisely that same relationship to Diderot and his concerns. Perhaps it is this understanding from within which makes this book, despite the potential tediousness of the subject, such exquisite reading.

LISELOTTE DIECKMANN

Washington University

MORLEY'S CANZONETS FOR THREE VOICES. By John Earle Uhler. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1957. 49 p., facsimile. (Louisiana State University Studies, Humanities Series, No. 7.)

Morley's Canzonets for Three Voices is a sequel to Professor Uhler's earlier publication, *Morley's Canzonets for Two Voices*, and, like the earlier work, consists largely of a facsimile reprint of partbooks containing the pieces. Preceding the facsimile, however, is a detailed discussion of the collection, primarily from the literary point of view. In his preface, in fact, Professor Uhler makes it clear that his study "is intended for the general student of the Renaissance" rather than for the musicologist. Of interest to the student of comparative literature are the interrelations of English and Italian madrigal verse and the German translations of Morley's text.

In his introductory essay Professor Uhler describes the English publication of Morley's three-part pieces against the madrigal background in general, reproduces the dedication to the Countess of Pembroke, and examines the question of the authorship of the text. On this last point, his argument lacks cogency: "In the absence of any convincing evidence to the contrary... why not assume that Morley wrote his own verse?"

The importance of interpolations in the madrigal text is brought out by a comparison of the simple basic poem which is set as the first song with its totally different form in the three vocal parts, where all the additional words and phrases have been interpolated. The English text for each song is reproduced from the *cantus* part of the original edition, 1593; literary and musical analyses of some of the pieces follow, in a somewhat labored effort to prove Morley's originality.

[2] Winckelmann had two motives in condemning the French. The first was, as Mr. Seznec points out, his attempt to overcome the Francomania of the German courts, certainly a much needed task. It is hard to see how he could have succeeded if he had praised the French instead of attacking them. The second motive was to educate the German public toward a sterner concept of ancient art. Is not Winckelmann's attack on certain French rococo sculptors much like Diderot's own attack on the same type of rococo painters?

Perhaps the most valuable part of the commentary is a concordance of pious texts adapted to Morley's music. These religious paraphrases are from a manuscript in Christ Church Library, Oxford, and are reproduced *in toto*, one for each of the twenty compositions in the musical collection.

Professor Uhler concludes his essay with information about German editions (1612, 1624), a reproduction of the dedication of the 1624 edition, information about the translator, and a reproduction of each of the German texts of the twenty madrigals. A facsimile reproduction of the three partbooks (*cantus, altus, bassus* from fragments at Hanover and Leipzig) of the German edition of 1624 makes up the largest portion of the book. There is no *bassus*, however, for the eighth song, since this part is missing in the German partbook. If one wonders why Professor Uhler reproduces Morley's three-part canzonets in a German edition with German text, one finds a not altogether satisfactory answer in the preface: "For the first time since 1624," he says, partbooks of the German edition "are reproduced and preserved here against the possibility of a catastrophe like a war which might destroy the originals, as the last war destroyed a copy at Breslau."

NAN COOKE CARPENTER

Montana State University

THE OLD ENGLISH APOLLONIUS OF TYRE. Edited by Peter Goolden. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. xxxvi, 74 p.

This is, in every way, an admirable piece of work, and one which should prove of use both to the student who finds little enough of genuine literary interest in easily accessible Anglo-Saxon records and to the mature scholar. The value of Mr. Goolden's edition is not affected by the appearance, in 1956, of the edition of Josef Raith; for the latter lacks the notes and glossary which Goolden effectively supplies. He has also furnished a notably good Introduction, in which he traces the history of the story of Apollonius of Tyre from its origins to the appearance of Lillo's *Marina* in 1738, gives an account of the manuscripts of the Latin text and the relations of the Old English version to it, discusses the literary qualities of both, and deals very adequately with questions of the date and dialect of the Old English translation.

Indeed, Mr. Goolden has done such thorough work that it would be difficult to find fault with him. I have noticed no errors, no faults of scholarship or of judgment. A few minor points do, however, occur to me. On p. xxiii he observes that *cwicsuslene hus* is an excellent translation of the Latin *Tartaream domum*. So it is; but he might have added that it is not a term original with the Anglo-Saxon translator: it is a poetic appelation for "hell" derived from Old English religious poetry. The rather unusual, though not unprecedented, form *ealdefæder* (p. 42, line 23) for *ealdfæder* scarcely required comment; but the somewhat exceptional word order which occasionally occurs in the text (e.g., p. 36, line 23) is an indication of late date which might have been mentioned in the Introduction. Mr. Goolden's statement that "Accents are spasmodically used to indicate vowel length" requires some qualification; they sometimes appear above short vowels as well: e.g., *genám*, p. 8, line 10, et passim. The occurrence of an occasional long *i* for *éo* (*find, frind*, p. 10, lines 19-20) might have been listed among the Late West Saxon forms listed on pp. xxviii ff. As an exception to his statement that the Anglo-Saxon translator carefully avoided Latin constructions ("the common

ablative absolute is nearly always lost sight of," p. xxiii, and note 2) he might have noticed the striking retention of the Latin construction in *Ðissum callum þus gedonum* for *His omnibus peractis,* p. 42, line 3.

These, however, are small matters. Mr. Goolden has done his work splendidly, and we should in particular be grateful for the excellently conflated Latin text and for the signally fine and complete Introduction. The Commentary also deserves notice for its accuracy and completeness.

ARTHUR G. BRODEUR

University of Oregon

KEATS AND THE DRAMATIC PRINCIPLE. By Bernice Slote. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1958. 229 p.

Miss Slote's good book aligns the study of Keats with a chief preoccupation of twentieth-century criticism from the early T. S. Eliot to the present—the artistic possibilities of dramatic objectivity. Scholars have long taken note of "the dramatic principle" in Keats, but Miss Slote is the first to give it full and systematic attention; she is in particular the first writer to set this quality against a background of contemporary theory. The results are illuminating.

In *Keats and the Dramatic Principle* the term "dramatic" has two different but related senses. It stands on the one hand for an attribute of Keats' mind and poetry, on the other for his specific relationship to formal drama and to the actual London theater as it existed in his lifetime. Thus Keats' poetry and letters both expound and exemplify objectivity, acceptance of the confusions and complexities of real life, motion, and dynamic oppositions. The well-known passages in the letters on "negative capability" and "passive receptivity" are restudied from this point of view, along with other evidence of Keats' interest in dramatic character, in himself, in other men, and in literature. Likewise the empathy so notable in his poetry is assimilated to the dramatic principle which Miss Slote shows evolving steadily within his work, in development of scene and diversification of point of view.

In a section on "The Play," Miss Slote provides a full account of the London stage of Keats' day, and presents the case, speculative but reasonable enough, for Keats' intimate knowledge of it. This study of the theater forms an introduction to the poet's formal essays in the drama, *Otho the Great* and the fragment *King Stephen,* in which Miss Slote finds both a considerable initial flair for dramatic construction and a remarkably swift development in technique. The book concludes with a substantial critique of the narrative *Lamia* as a dramatic poem.

This culminating critique is a real contribution to our understanding of a poem which has received an unusual amount of attention in the last few years. The author has read her predecessors with care, and in so doing has strengthened her own thoroughly original interpretation of *Lamia.* One respects a reading so obviously well considered and in the best sense orthodox. The thesis of the dramatic focuses emphasis upon Keats' organic use of scene and episode, upon devices of preparation and foreshadowing, and upon the dramatic elements of motion, "transformation" (partly attributable to the poet's knowledge of pantomime), dynamic oppositions, objectivity, and plot balance. This emphasis involves an argument against previous interpretations of *Lamia* as a personal or psychological or aesthetic allegory, against which Miss Slote makes a convincing case.

Her explanation of the dramatic principle in Keats is exciting, useful, and just. It is not least useful, perhaps, in the questions it inevitably raises—questions which the author has no necessary obligation to answer, it should be said, in her persuasive exposition. As is almost inevitable, the problem arises of the relation of definition to value. Is the "dramatic" one possible mode among others, or is it a criterion by which poetry should be judged? Is "dramatic" poetry, for instance, essentially superior to "personal" poetry? What is meant when we speak of the dramatic qualities of a narrative? Are these simply the best qualities of which narrative is capable, or do we mean that, insofar as a narrative is dramatic, it is impinging upon a different and a superior kind of art? Is *Lamia* a better poem than *The Eve of St. Agnes* because it is more dramatic, as *Keats and the Dramatic Principle* implies? Again, Miss Slote employs "romantic" as a term synonymous with "personal" and opposed to "dramatic." The context makes the meaning and intention clear, but one would not like to accept this conception of romanticism as definitive.

Emphasis upon the dramatic in Keats leads to emphasis upon movement in Keats' poetry—which is interesting and surprising because criticism has generally pointed out the images of stillness and the relative slowness of movement in its combination of sound and sense. Though Miss Slote traces in *Lamia* a series of shifts and transformations as scene follows scene, one could maintain that these scenes in themselves are noticeably static—that one remembers best tableau-like moments with the stillness of sculpture, such as Hermes hovering over his adored nymph in "One warm, flushed moment," or Apollonius fixing the unhappy Lamia with his unblinking stare. If *Lamia* is a kind of drama with characters, scenes, and dialogue, it is a special kind—which is not to deny the appropriateness and value of the dramatic analogy.

The best part of Miss Slote's valuable book is its careful, temperate, yet eloquent argument for the primacy of the poem itself, as thing and as act, as the object for the critic's consideration. This affirmation is to a degree a negation or a nugation of the literalist scholarship of sources, of biography, and of ideas. In this respect the author agrees with a large body of modern criticism, but her conclusions are much more acceptable than most assertions of artistic autonomy because they follow a genuine argument, which does not reject scholarly inquiry but puts it in its place. Thus her painstaking examination of the probable "sources" for *Lamia* rejects nothing that early scholars have proposed; but the very multiplicity of these sources convincingly indicates that the poem itself is very different from any of them or from the sum or from any composite of all of them. Miss Slote's sense of the balance between poet and poem is also exceptionally delicate and just, preserving a place for historical scholarship and psychological exploration in the complex synthesis which a really vital aesthetic criticism must be.

RICHARD HARTER FOGLE

Tulane University

JORGE GUILLÉN OU LE CANTIQUE ÉMERVEILLÈ. By Pierre Darmangeat. Librairie des Éditions Espagnoles, 1958. 150 p.

Dadas las dificultades innegables de la poesía de Jorge Guillén, los libros y artículos de exégesis que se multiplican hoy traen una necesaria partícula de luz. Pero también, dígase sin ambages, contribuyen todas y cada una de las explicaciones

de su poesía a oscurecerla un poco, al ménos en tanto que se convierten en puntos de referencia necesarios para el lector incauto. Quizá esta misma complicación haya llevado a Pierre Darmangeat a intentar atrapar lo esencial de Guillén por medio de un método limitado, la *explication de texte*, unido aquí, mayormente en las notas, a un esbozo de estudio de las variantes en los poemas a través de sus múltiples correcciones en distintas ediciones. Claro que la extensión de *Cántico* le ha impedido al crítico explicar todos los poemas y nos presenta Pierre Darmangeat en *Jorge Guillén ou Le Cantique émerveillé* sólo una pequeña colección de poemas con comentarios que se unen para ofrecer una introducción a esta obra de Guillén.

Además, como es sabido, se ha comenzado ya la publicación de lo que podríamos llamar el segundo Jorge Guillén, su *Clamor*, y nunca más necesaria que hoy una comprensión total de la obra terminada antes de adentrarse por lo nuevo. Por desgracia, la crítica anda siempre retrasada y nos hace falta aún algo más completo que el libro de Darmangeat o los otros que tenemos. Lo que no desmerece el esfuerzo.

Como pasa con todo libro casi exclusivamente dedicado a la explicación de los textos, resumir éste sería repetirlo. Su contenido es conciso y completo en sí mismo. A veces, siguiendo una tendencia anterior en la crítica de Jorge Guillén, parece dejarse llevar el autor a exageraciones que quizá sean parte de nuestra miopía contemporánea. Por ejemplo en la importancia que le otorga a la posición de cada poema en el índice del libro ("l'avant dernier rang dans cette section: une valeur quasi conclusive," p. 127) o a la puntuación y la tipografía (véase el detalle con que se estudia "l'hésitation de Guillén a propos de la virgule," p. 34, o "la typographie . . . conserve d'ailleurs la majuscule de *Después* qui répond a celle de *Instante*, et laisse à ce mot sa valeur intellectuelle, son individualité tout ensemble charnelle et mythique," p. 22). El uso frecuente de fragmentos de poemas para explicar otros—método crítico excelente—nos hace pensar si hay una necesidad ineludible de hacerlo, y, en tal caso, si tal necesidad debe responder a una falta en los poemas que requieren explicación por medio de otros. Por degracia el crítico francés no responde ni se plantea preguntas de esta índole.

Pero estas aberraciones menores y vacíos necesarios—comunes algunos al poeta y a sus críticos—no detractan del valor esencial de un libro bien pensado. Sí que detracta, por lo contrario, un fenómeno aparente en muchos críticos de poetas modernos: el dejarse llevar por la admiración de lo reciente y condenar, casi sin darse cuenta, todo el pasado milenario de la cultura, o poco menos. Que es lo que parece suceder cuando habla Darmangeat de "la niaiserie anti-poétique qui consiste à prêter à la nature les sentiments ou les desseins de l'homme" (p. 10). Hay que estar en guardia siempre contra afirmaciones que si bien, por una parte, ponen de relieve la escasez de tal figura de pensamiento—en este caso lo que John Ruskin llamaba la "pathetic fallacy"—en el autor estudiado, pueden, por la otra, negar valor a todos los poetas que la usan.

Dos rasgos importantes de este estudio, que lo hacen más completo de lo que parece a primera vista, son el análisis de las relaciones fraternales de la poesía de Jorge Guillén con la de Pedro Salinas en un capítulo especial, "L' Imminence et la merveille dans la poésie de Salinas et dans *Cántico*" (pp. 114-124), así como en numerosos momentos en el texto mismo (pp. 8, 12, 13, 127-130), y las sugerencias siempre pertinentes de relaciones con la literatura francesa (Mallarmé, p. 41, Claudel, p. 61, Proust, p. 130). Dentro de esto último, el problema fascinante de la influencia en Jorge Guillén de Paul Valéry se aborda en la página 136 no sin antes sugerirse en variados detalles (pp: 46, 72-73, 132, 135). Sin duda, queda

todavía por hacerse el estudio completo de esta relación, para el cual las surgerencias de Pierre Darmangeat y otros críticos podrán dar el impulso necesario.

BERNARDO GICOVATE

Tulane University

THE JAPANESE TRADITION IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE. By Earl Miner. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958. xxi, 312 p.

The appearance of Earl Miner's excellent book is itself a phenomenon of what he calls, rather optimistically, the period of "late mature absorption" in the cycle of our literary interest in Japan. Cherry blossom exotica and the English *haiku* are equally out of fashion, to the regret of few, but the general level of knowledge about Japanese culture among our writers is now higher than ever. As imperfect as Western understanding of Japan may yet be, it has benefited from the extraordinary postwar flourishing studies and translations; significantly, the author of this book, though a professor of English, has a firsthand acquaintance with Japanese literature.

The book begins with a summary chapter of cultural history ("The Meeting of East and West"), surveying the early European and nineteenth-century American images of Japan. In the second chapter ("New Images and Stereotypes of Japan") we come at once to the period of exoticism in full bloom—the Japan of minor Victorian poetry, of the stage, of Pierre Loti and pseudo-Japanese fiction (to which the stories of William Plomer offer a brilliant contrast), and, above all, to the "Ghostly Japan" of the excessively popular writings of Lafcadio Hearn. Hearn is also a symbol to the Japanese themselves, who have paid him the compliment of translating his complete works (three times). The other, less public aspects of that myopic stylist are left for later discussion, in connection with the vital change from *Japonisme* to impressionism.

If the boundary between *japon-niaiserie* and the true Japanese contribution to a new pictorial vogue in the arts remains uncertain even after Mr. Miner's analysis, we find him at his most self-assured in the long chapter which he devotes to Ezra Pound. It is perhaps here that the author's knowledge of Japanese literature is particularly helpful. Pound's use of techniques derived from the *haiku* and the *nō*, as well as his influential theories on imagery and the infamous "ideogram," are set forth with admirable clarity in the light of this knowledge. To be sure, what Pound calls the "form of super-position"—a metaphorical technique which he might also have discovered in the ancient Chinese *Book of Songs*—seems to be chiefly an instance of the spurious modernity of his readings in exotic literatures. There are many other dubious pieces in Pound's collection of Orientalia. Yet his often curious notions of Japanese poetry are reflected throughout his work as critic, translator, and poet—even, in spite of his predominant later interest in Chinese history and literature, as the poet of the *Cantos*. Readers eager to explore the jungle of Ezra Pound's fertile misapprehensions may find little that has not hitherto been explicated, but neither will they be led astray as they so often have been by enthusiastic critics of Pound's achievement in having (to quote the author's reiterated epigraph) "gathered from the air a live tradition."

Another substantial chapter ("The Absorption of Japan into Twentieth-Century Poetry") deals with a variety of poets from the imagists to William Empson; the new realism which Mr. Miner discerns would perhaps have seemed less tame had

he extended his treatment of the "visiting poets" to include the lively author of *Bread Without Blossoms,* D. J. Enright. After an appropriately slight acknowledgment of miscellaneous Western interest in the *kabuki* and the *nō* he concludes his book, except for a final summary, with an account of Japanese influence in the work of the other major poet, besides Pound, who discovered valuable techniques in Japanese literature. The chapter on Yeats is of course centered on his interest in the *nō*. One hopes for further and more detailed studies of this intricate subject; for it is the poetic dramas of Yeats, together with the theories and techniques of Pound, that justify an ambitious attempt to assess the importance of Japan to English literature.

Still, those who prefer to dismiss Japanese literature as a mass of exquisite trivialties and slightly bogus profundities will not easily yield their skepticism to the arguments of this book. For its purpose is, naturally, to record the effect of influences which, at their most benign, have as often as not been "based upon half-understandings which illuminate because they tell the age what it seeks to know." Beyond the limits of knowledge here traced lie forms and beauties of which our poets, novelists, dramatists, and literary theorists are still scarcely aware. One wonders, not without trepidation, what Pound might have wrought had Fenollosa's notes included materials on *renga* ("linked-verse"), or what the imagists might have found in the *tanka* and *haiku* with the aid of such fine studies as those mentioned in the bibliographical notes which complete this book. To these, incidentally, should be added a valuable article by Mr. Miner in collaboration with Robert H. Brower: "Formative Elements in the Japanese Poetic Tradition" (*Journal of Asian Studies,* XVI [Aug. 1957]).

HOWARD HIBBETT

Harvard University

TRENDS AND STYLES IN TWENTIETH CENTURY FRENCH LITERATURE. By Helmut Hatzfeld. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1957. ix, 262 p.

This book is unlike any other known to the present reviewer. Its aesthetic observations are organized by one of the most erudite stylistic critics of our day, and its judgments are given an extra dimension by the moral and spiritual insights of a fervent Catholicism. The materials vary in quality, and on occasion the dogmatic emphasis will distract informed readers who do not share the author's religious views; but the Catholic vantage point affords a remarkable perspective over much of the uneasy and complicated French literature of the twentieth century.

In his preface Professor Hatzfeld notes that his study is addressed in general to educated readers, and to advanced undergraduate and graduate students in French. The book "singles out trends ... deeply rooted in problems of contemporary life or in burning questions of principles of literary art ... refers critically to scholarly research on the literary style and structure of special works and ... endeavors to understand all trends and styles ..." It includes a preface, an introduction, eight chapters, an epilogue, notes, a general bibliography, and an index. The whole volume is admittedly an attempt to show French literature of the twentieth century as "a phenomenological prism of persistent and still existing trends reducible to a unity ... [in] a kind of *anti-réalisme.*"

The author identifies representative opposing forces in contemporary French

literature as on the one side "Promethean revolutionaries against God" such as Rivière, Gide, Duhamel, and Thierry Maulnier, and on the other such Catholic intellectuals as Claudel, Charles Du Bos, Bernanos, and Mauriac. Much of the book is devoted to contrasting interpretations of human experience and to the techniques of their presentation through new literary devices amidst the relativism and intuitional probings of the creative contemporary mind. Developments in painting, music, and the dance are adduced in some cases for illustrative parallels.

In our time characteristic representations of the individual seem small when compared with those of earlier days. Yet contemporary man is seen by artists in extremely complex ways, and the problem of absurdity or transcendence lends a peculiar fascination to our century's depiction of human character, suffering, and joy. In his first chapter, Professor Hatzfeld examines the phenomenon of collectivism in contemporary French literature. A major figure here is Jules Romains (Louis Farigoule), whose intuitive unanimism is identified as an unconscious adaptation of Herder's romantic idea of a collective soul, and whose *roman-fleuve, Les hommes de bonne volonté,* is called a "gigantic piece of *reportage*... [that] may be read as the story of group-struggles in the modern world." The chapter is burdened with rather lengthy résumés of long novels; but collectivist tendencies are underlined in the works of a number of representative novelists concerned with the family (Roger Martin du Gard and Georges Duhamel), the political awakening of the masses (André Malraux), the spirit of dangerous activity (St. Exupéry), resistance to Hitlerism (Vercors [Jean Bruller]), torture, prison camps, etc.; and there are scattered stylistic comments of varying interest.

Chapter II ("The Voices of Sex, Earth and Clan") is concerned with a sort of primitive animalism and "pan-sexualism" recurrent in modern literature. Here Colette is considered a significant precursor with her amoral *naturisme,* her understanding of the life of instinct, and her remarkable gift of language. Professor Hatzfeld cites the development of an analogous spirit in the writings of Maurice Barrès (*Les Déracinés, La Colline inspirée*) with their call for instinctive roots in the ancient soil of France. This "rootlust" (as D. H. Lawrence called it) and "spirit of earth" is considered a key to the work of such writers as Charles Ferdinand Ramuz (*La grande peur dans la montagne,* 1926) and Jean Giono (*Le Chant du monde,* 1934), and is traced in the writings of Jérôme and Jean Tharaud and Paul Morand.

The third chapter ("Introspection. New Aspects of Love. Acte Gratuit") is the longest and one of the most interesting chapters in the book. Nearly a third of it is devoted to Marcel Proust, called here the century's outstanding writer in "the artistic discovery of the subconscious," whose "dark zone" is seen as having already provided a "super-reality" for Christian experience in St. Paul, the Church Fathers, the mediaeval philosophers, and the great sixteenth-century mystics. Proust is credited with rediscovering for literature an experience that had fascinated Plato and that modern psychology refers to as the *déjà-vu*; and the transfiguration of such experience brought unpredictably from the subconscious is called "the great surrealism" of his book. Some of the stylistic observations here are of unusual interest. Proust's complex style is seen as a mirror of his complex world; and his syntax is said (in Professor Spitzer's terms) to represent the soul's movements in an almost onomatopoeic way. Although his style has been compared with Bossuet's for its refined prolixity and with Descartes' for the "endless subordinations" of its logic, Proust is "a great symbolist" (as Fiser has shown) and his imagery "makes him one of the most modern authors." Moreover, his analysis of

love as self-centered jealousy and desire for domination seems to represent a significant aspect of contemporary thought.

The writings of François Mauriac and Julien Green provide another dimension to the contemporary analysis of love. The concept of sin permeates the whole view of life in these Catholic writers, whose morbid and suffering characters reflect as clearly as Proust's the maladies of an age. The Catholic view of man and of the human situation is often dark indeed. (See the statement of Graham Greene: "Human nature is not black and white but black and grey.") But this is not considered man's unalterable state. If in Mauriac "nobody is pure"—if Thérèse Desqueyroux of *La Fin de la nuit* (1935) is called "this new Phèdre, this new Mme Bovary"—the Catholic viewpoint changes the whole possible significance in the representation of miserable lives. This is nowhere more evident than in the contrasting effects of relatively similar degradations in the fictional characters of the Catholic writers and those say of Proust or Jean-Paul Sartre.

Professor Hatzfeld finds one of contemporary literature's great achievements in "the newly discovered love psychology of the couple," and adds: "While the nineteenth century needs the eternal triangle to analyze love and hatred between man and woman, the twentieth analyzes the couple isolated within its relations of hatred or love, and generally unhappy. There exists a fundamental hate between the sexes..." Many Catholic and non-Catholic writers of our day seem peculiarly committed to this sombre emphasis.

The *acte gratuit* is considered at some length in terms of "the subconscious tendency of man to anarchy" and in the shadow of those creatures of modern myth, the Ego and the Id. Professor Hatzfeld draws a clear line between two ways of considering the matter: "The rationalists speak in this connection of an irresistible urge, the believers even of the devil." André Gide is a central figure in this discussion. His style, reflecting his protean character, has been called by Etiemble "an atticism modified by Stalinism." Professor Hatzfeld adds that, though Gide's style is often considered classical, it still "seethes with latent emotion," and he remarks Gide's "unusually long and unusually placed adverbs," his "dissonant harmonies," and his fictional technique shifting between narration and commentary.

A very different type of writing is examined in Chapter IV ("Forms of Evasion"), which is concerned with the theme of exoticism, strange longing, and departure voiced so unforgettably by Baudelaire and Mallarmé and caught, perhaps, in the haunting phrase of Verlaine: "O ces wagons qui vont dévaler dans la plaine!" The escape can be into space (Paul Morand, Valery Larbaud) or into time and an inner world (Marcel Proust, Alain Fournier) or into an ironic fairyland (Giraudoux). Adjacent to these worlds are those glimpsed in the surrealist exploitation of dreams and madness, whose characteristic use of metaphor (e.g., "Le monde rentre dans un sac" for approaching dark) is called "a two-dimensional art of arbitrary combinations, a sentimental anarchy."

Chapter V on "Existentialist Engagement" traces briefly the development of existentialist thought and examines in some detail writings of Sartre, Camus, Simone de Beauvoir, and Jean Anouilh. In Sartre's world, where "the triumphant symbols of fire and air are lacking," moral depravity is symbolized by earth and water, slime and viscosity. Sartre's reinterpretations of guilt and atonement are identified as "typical secularizations of Christian values"; but his *engagement* has no place for Christian conscience and Christian repentance. Sartre is "a naturalist with symbolic purposes." *La Mort dans l'âme* is comparable with *La Débâcle* of Zola; and Sartre's style, resembling Zola's "in moments of sym-

bolic condensation," is linked also with surrealism, unanimism, and techniques of American novelists. Theophil Spoerri is cited for his observation that passages in Sartre's writing show him "truly haunted by the God whose death he tries to proclaim."

In Camus, Professor Hatzfeld finds "Existentialism crossed with American behaviorism, and not distinguishable from it." As for Mme de Beauvoir, "no one can doubt that... [she] has penetrated to the heart of the evils of our times." Jean Anouilh "does not understand the value of suffering." His concept of man "can reach tragic proportions" but not real tragedy. Professor Hatzfeld accuses the contemporary existentialists of making man "simply an item in the inventory of things," and concludes: "This is the graveyard climate and the end of the alleged *littérature engagée*, the Promethean revolt, the 'acceptance' of the absurd, a dead end, which seems not to admit of any *Sursum corda*."

There is a strange exaltation in parts of Chapter VI ("Spirituality"). Significant among the numerous writers considered here are such figures as Charles Péguy, Gabriel Marcel, and Jean Cayrol ("a Catholic Sartre"); but the greatest attention is given to Paul Claudel and Georges Bernanos. A recurrent motif with Claudel is shown to be the lack of fulfillment in earthly love. Claudel is called a "linguistic revolutionary," and the uniqueness of his symbolism is discoverd in "its liturgical quality." His mind is seen moving between two poles, "a well-placed solemnity of awe and a sometimes misplaced realism." Professor Hatzfeld notes the "enormous magnetic fields" of Claudel's nouns and verbs and calls his poetic qualities more lyrical than truly dramatic. Bernanos is represented as seeing man *embarqué* amidst "suffering and injustice, love and hatred, virtue and sin, purity and guilt, God and immortality," which Bernanos identifies intuitively not as *problems* but as *mysteries*. Like Claudel he sees egocentric love as a dangerous barrier to the love of God: "Nous ressemblons à des fous qui tendent les bras vers le reflet de la lune dans l'eau." Bernanos' greatest originality is discovered in his creation of hero priests. In the diabolic possession of the apostate Cénabre of *L'Imposture* Professor Hatzfeld finds the *anguish* of Heidegger and Sartre; and he remarks of this despairful priest that "he does not know, any more than did Freud, Jung, and Adler, that only Love can liberate."

Chapter VII ("Abstract Art and Pure Poetry") contains observations of interest on the practice of such writers as Eluard, Cocteau, St.-John Perse, and Supervielle, and presents some of the ideas on *poésie pure* expressed by the Abbé Bremond and Paul Valéry, whose requirements are seen to coincide in great part with those stated by André Breton for surrealism. Professor Hatzfeld defines *poésie pure* as "the ideal of a poetry which is as free as possible from prose elements, a poetry which is made more of hints than of precisions, more of suggestions than of definitions, more of feeling than of meaning, more of associations than of explanations."

The final chapter ("Collective Stylistic Achievements") sees two important sources for the stylistic achievements of our age, in surrealism ("as the view of a world to be recomposed from the fragments into which the author has split it") and the movies (with their technique of simultaneity). Verlaine's impressionism, with its oneiric language for the description of nature and its "shaded" meanings, is taken as a starting point for the gradual development into the later expressionistic-surrealistic language of our day. Examples of the latter are given from such writers as Colette, Paul Eluard, Julien Gracq, Jules Romains, André Gide, Paul Morand, Giraudoux, Mauriac, Proust, Sartre, and Camus. Camus' description

in *La Peste* of the rats carrying plague germs is called a classic example of the fusion of the oneiric and realistic styles for an effect of "reality ... evoked as a nightmare by a chaotic accumulation of details characteristic of Rabelais." There is some discussion of the stream or flux of consciousness and of the multiple- or superimposed-plane technique ("a new baroque") employed in French fiction even for character delineation. There are many fascinating details of stylistic analysis in this chapter. One statement in particular is likely to be remembered: "Contemporary style is extremely tense and almost always ambiguous." The psychological compulsions for this in many writers should be evident in our time.

In a brief Epilogue Professor Hatzfeld observes that contemporary literature seems quite evidently "an arguing literature." In much of it he discovers "not mere wantonness but the sincere analysis of the human condition and the tragic plight of modern man." Even the revolutionary denial of God seems to Professor Hatzfeld to reveal God "present by implication in every line written."

ALFRED G. ENGSTROM

University of North Carolina

BOOKS RECEIVED

Albérès, R. M. L'Aventure intellectuelle du xx^e siècle. Panorama des littératures européennes 1900-1959. Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1959. 444 p.

Aristotle. On Poetry and Style. Translated, with an introduction, by G. M. A. Grube. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1958. xxxii, 110 p.

Barber, C. L. Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959. x, 265 p.

Bate, Walter Jackson. Prefaces to Criticism. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1959. xii, 228 p.

Baumgarten, Sandor. Le Crépuscule néo-classique: Thomas Hope. Paris: Didier, 1958. 272 p.

Bennett, Josephine W., Oscar Cargill, and Vernon Hall, Jr. (editors). Studies in the English Renaissance Drama. New York: New York University Press, 1959. xxvi, 368 p.

Blankenhorn, Gisela. Der Kosmopolitismus bie Valery Larbaud. Wiesbaden: Limes Verlag, 1958. 188 p.

Bloom, Harold. Shelley's Mythmaking. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959. 279 p.

Campbell, Jackson J. (editor). The Advent Lyrics of the Exeter Book. Translation and introduction by Jackson J. Campbell. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959. lx, 137 p.

Cavafy, C. P. Poèmes. Translated by Georges Papoutsakis with a preface by André Mirambel. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1958. 278 p.

Cooney, Timothy. Ultimate Desires. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. x, 100 p.

Del Litto V. La Vie intellectuelle de Stendhal. Genèse et évolution des ses idées (1802-1821). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959. 730 p.

Demetz, Peter. Marx, Engels und die Dichter. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1959. 341 p.

Dewey, John. Art as Experience. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958. 355 p.

Diringer, David. The Story of the Aleph Beth. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. 195 p.

Duff, Charles. Spanish for Beginners: A Simplified Guide to the Language of Twenty Countries. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1958. xviii, 334 p.

Emery, Clark. Ideas into Action. A Study of Pound's Cantos. Coral Gables, Fla.: University of Miami Press, 1958. xi, 196 p.

Ferrater Mora, José. Ortega y Gasset: etapas de una filosofía. Barcelona: Editorial Seix Barral, 1958. 145 p.

Figuera Aymerich, Angela. Belleza cruel. Mexico City: Compañía General de Ediciones, 1958. 134 p.

Fowler, David C. Prowess and Charity in the Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1959. viii, 81 p.